

PLAN

REPORT OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF A PUBLIC HEARING
BEFORE THE VILLAGE OF ARLINGTON HEIGHTS
PLAN COMMISSION

COMMISSION

RE: CRESCENT PLACE - 310 WEST RAND ROAD - PC #21-010
AMENDMENT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FROM 'COMMERCIAL' TO
'MODERATE DENSITY MULTI-FAMILY', REZONING FROM THE B-2 DISTRICT TO THE
R-6 DISTRICT, PRELIMINARY PLAT OF SUBDIVISION TO CONSOLIDATE THE
SUBJECT PROPERTY INTO ONE LOT

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS had before the Village of
Arlington Heights Plan Commission Meeting taken at the Arlington Heights Village Hall,
33 South Arlington Heights Road, 3rd Floor Board Room, Arlington Heights, Illinois
on the 23rd day of June, 2021 at the hour of 7:45 p.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SUSAN DAWSON, Chairperson
LYNN JENSEN
JOSEPH LORENZINI
BRUCE GREEN
GEORGE DROST
TERRY ENNES
JOHN SIGALOS

ALSO PRESENT:

SAM HUBBARD, Development Planner
JACOB SCHMIDT, Development Planner

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, next item on the agenda is Crescent Place.

Do we have the Petitioner? Sure.

Okay, before you begin, have all public notices been given? Yes?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, they have.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

Okay, will both of you be presenting to us this evening?

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes.

MR. GREEN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, so if you could both then please respond to do you swear to tell the truth on all matters discussed during the public hearing this evening?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: We have another person coming up.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, we have another person; we have a third. So, yes, you all -- oh, we've got a fourth, look at that.

Anybody else want to just come on up? Just kidding.

(Witnesses sworn.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, before you begin, one at a time when you go step up to do whatever portion you'll be speaking to, could you please state your name and spell your last name for the court reporter?

MR. GREEN: Of course, thank you. Mr. Zunamon is going to begin, so the rest of us will disappear momentarily.

MR. ZUNAMON: All right, well, good evening. Yes, I'm Jake Zunamon, it's Z-u-n-a-m-o-n. I am Senior Vice President of Development with Housing Trust Group. We're a nationally renowned affordable workforce housing developers out of Florida. This past year, we were actually ranked number 20 in the top 50 of groups in the country. So, this is our bread and butter; this is what we do.

A little bit of history about this particular development. Last year with COVID, I moved my family up here. I'm initially from Evanston. I actually used to do some work in Arlington Heights, helping people sign up for Affordable Care Act. Obviously, a beautiful community you guys have here, love the building. We decided, hey, you know, why don't we try to expand a little bit into Illinois?

We partnered Turnstone Development Group who has been a fantastic nonprofit partner, really great reputation with the state, has done a lot of developments in the north and south suburbs of Cook County. So, yes, we basically, you know, found this piece of land, spoke with the seller. I know it's been sitting vacant for a while and kind of proposed this development.

Working with your Staff has been phenomenal. I think we initially kind of broached the idea back in maybe October of 2020, started working on site plans with them, got a lot of great feedback. I've definitely enjoyed the process. I think, you know, from every Commission meeting we've been to, from meeting all the folks on this initially to the Design Commission that we recently did, just really have helped us to elevate the design of this community. Since that meeting, we've actually been awarded tax credits and sought funding from not only the state IHDA, about \$15 million plus in that, another \$1 million from Cook County, and we're just excited to bring this \$16 million 40-unit community to Arlington Heights.

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

So, that's the quick background. Some of the images you have on the screen are existing developments that the Housing Trust Group, my company, on top and Turnstone below have built in both Florida and Illinois. We currently, you know, own and manage over 3,000 units, and yes, we're long-term owners, managers. We're here to be here and just excited to be back in person and see everybody.

So, with that, I'm going to bring John Green back up who is our fantastic architect, and he's going to explain a little bit more about the development before we get into the Staff report.

MR. HUBBARD: Mr. Green, there should be a projector. There you go, you got it.

MR. GREEN: Good evening. I'm John Green with GroundWork Architects, Engineers and Planners located in Buffalo Grove at 351 West Dundee. We are here --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Could you spell your last name for us as well?

MR. GREEN: Green like the color, G-r-e-e-n.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No extra e on the end?

MR. GREEN: No extra e, just two in the middle. We are here for this parcel regarding a 40-unit proposed affordable housing development. We're here for three requests. The first one is a lot consolidation. The site is surrounded by Stonebridge to the north, there is a Commonwealth Edison transfer station to the east, and there is a Commonwealth Edison small right-of-way to the south, farther south of that is commercial development, and to the west there are some townhomes and there is a manor home development for memory care individuals.

The site has sat there vacant for about 20 years. You can see the remnants of the parking lot, and the lighter area is about where the building is as I understood it. The last things that have been done there had been the sale of Christmas trees.

The three requests coming before you are to consolidate this area. There are currently two lots on the site that compose the site. The northern lot is a triangular shaped lot that follows the curve around on Chestnut. That is already currently zoned R-6. The southern portion of it which is where the restaurant was is zoned B-2. So, we are requesting a consolidation of it into a single lot.

The second thing we would be requesting is that it have a single zoning over the lot, all R-6. So, essentially, we're down-zoning the part that is B-2 into R-6, which would eliminate any commercial uses and allow for only the residential uses.

The third thing that we're asking for is for an amendment to the, your Comprehensive Plan since this parcel, that portion that is currently B-2, is listed in the Comprehensive Plan as commercial because it was. The parcel is isolated from the balance of the commercial to the south because of that right-of-way. There is currently an access for the restaurant that's existed forever right off of Route 12-Rand Road. We would be eliminating that access as part of our proposal, taking away what we consider to be a relatively dangerous access point.

I should state that we have received your Staff reports. We have reviewed the Staff report. We concur with all of their recommendations. We have no objections and no comments, no negative comments to them at all. I will reiterate what Mr. Zunamon has said, we have worked very, very hard and I hope very well with your Staff. When we come to a community, we consider that the Staff members of the community are probably the best

representatives of what is in the heart and minds of its community. We try to come together with them at a level meeting ground to use their skill and their knowledge to help us make our development better as we go through the process.

We are not asking for a planned unit development. That's fairly unusual for a development of this size. But the reason why we're not doing that is because we're not asking for any variations. Once under R-6, we will meet all of the ordinance requirements.

We are proposing 40 units total. They are only one-bedroom and two-bedroom, they are 21 bedrooms and 22 bedrooms. We will meet all of the bulk standards in this facility for height, setbacks, coverage, parking, density, stormwater management, and landscaping.

We started this process, as Jake had indicated, back in October. In December, we had a Conceptual Plan meeting, or I'm sorry, in January we had a Conceptual Plan meeting with the members of this Commission that provided additional feedback. We have since that meeting moved forward at the request of the Staff and at your suggestions and had a neighbor meeting which we did in March of this year.

We also have gone to the Housing Commission. As you know, the Village of Arlington Heights recently approved a new ordinance for affordable housing. We are I guess the first ones to come through with a development that not only meets the desires and requirements of that affordable housing desire and program, but this entire building is affordable housing.

We also have been to the Design Commission. We have gone through the meetings with them. We are approved by the Housing Commission based on the representations I just offered to you, and we also were approved recently by the [Design] Commission. The [Design] Commission had six stipulations or regulations that they wanted us to include. The plans that you are seeing today include all six of those. We have subsequently gone back to Steve Hautzinger who oversees that for the Plan Commission and have presented the modified documents to him. So, we have concluded making all of the revisions. I know it's one of your Staff conditions, so it's not hard for us to agree to them because you're going to see them all, they're in here already.

During the process, we went through two rounds of Staff review comments with Planning, two rounds with the Design Commission, three rounds of engineering reviews. In addition to that, we started with a Staff review back in October of last year. We called that the bible. Once we got the outline from every Staff Department of what they felt was important for this development to be viable, to comply with the rules and regulations of the zoning for Arlington Heights, we did not deviate from it.

The plan that I've put up before you now is a comparison site plan. On the bottom is the plan that was shown and discussed at the Plan Commission preliminary consultation meeting. The plan at the top is the final plan that is being presented to you today. You may note that there are very few differences between then and now. While they're different, they were important. We've had to rework the driveway and driveway entrances to miss existing streetlights. We've had to re-work or we've re-balanced the parking around the building.

We have, from the Staff reports, needed to, yes, needed to comply with their request to enhance the landscaping significantly along the south side of the property. You'll see that on the landscape plan. So, you'll see the parking lot bending a little bit, so we did

a little bit of pulling and pushing so that we could add the additional landscaping. Once we added the landscaping, the Staff reviewed it and said, well, can you add a little more, and we did. We kept bending the lot until we could make grading work, so it conforms to all grading requirements, or exceeds all the grading requirements for the Village standards.

The building itself, as I said, consists of 40 units. There are 10 units per floor. The western end of the building as you saw on the rendering has a lot of geometric movement to it. That is the front door to Rand Avenue. So, we wanted to step it down as it approached there, give it interest, used the geometry of it, and that entire section that has the two, three and four-story portion is all common space, community space within the building. We believe in creating a development that is, that forms neighborhoods.

So, each of the floors becomes its own neighborhood. There's common community space on each floor. The building includes a community room, it includes a cyber cafe, it includes a library, it includes individual tenant storage, it includes a bike storage, a secure bike storage room on the first floor. It also includes the units which have different designations by IHDA. We are required by them to have 10 percent of the units be fully accessible.

The units that you see in yellow are fully accessible units. The jigsaw puzzle part of it is they must be representative of all the different types of units so there is no discrimination on unit types for people with disabilities. We must also have 20 percent of the building for people who might have a need for assistance or have accessibility requirements in the future. Eight of the units are shown in blue. Those are constructed completely adaptable. They made all the turnaround access requirements, all the bracing and grab bar requirements are in place.

An interesting little fact about them is they have showers with removable curbs. I know it may seem like a silly thing, but when you're in the shower, if you don't have to roll into the shower, the water splashes out to the floor which creates a bit of a dangerous situation. When you need to roll into the shower, you need to roll into the shower. So, these showers have a curb that's integral to it that snap out so that if we have to change the unit, we now can make a shower completely accessible without having to have anybody who doesn't need the accessibility have that issue of relating to the floor. It's a relatively new development. We used them on three or four other buildings. Those are the little things that, as I mentioned, that we kept working through as we went through this process.

All the other units that are in white, they are not constructed accessible, but they are all adaptable. So, if the need arises, any one of those units, should we exceed the 12 units that are there that have been adapted, have a need to service a resident, we can adapt that unit readily, although we do little secrets. Like we put double backing behind the cabinets in the kitchen because you have to lower the upper cabinets when a unit becomes accessible. So, if you just put up the normal backing that you nail the cabinets to, you've got to take down the wall. We put up a double backing, so just take them down and move them down. This is the level of detail that's necessary to create a project of this type and, at the same time, to make it affordable.

There are no differences within the units for any person, whether they have an accessibility need or an income differential. They are all identical in their finished design and program.

On the site, we have exceeded the landscaping requirements

considerably. We also are putting in the parkway trees that do not currently exist on Chestnut. We have created layering of landscaping from Rand to the building that you can see. There's some landscaping that's immediately close to Rand, and there's another layer of landscaping that's just on the east side of the driveway, and then next to the building there's another layer of landscaping. That behind it is the section that is moving up and down two, three, and four stories.

We split the parking around the building to provide the shortest travel distances for everyone to get into the building. We are also required by IHDA to do 10 percent handicap spaces, not five. So, that's why you see additional handicap spaces on the plan. We had several discussions with the Staff, particularly during the Design Commission and following with the Staff reviews that they even wanted us to enclose the only one piece of equipment we have on the ground, and that's the electric transformer which is about six-foot by six-foot by five-foot. It's enclosed.

We've tried to meet and exceed all of those conditions. You can see the extensive landscaping along the south, much of that is evergreen. There is a really nice, tall tree there that may not be the best specimen in the world, but when you start with a 40-foot tree right there where you want to create some landscaping, you don't take it down. That's where you see some of the changes and maneuvering. Once we knew we could save that tree, we were going to find a way to do that.

We also are saving a number of trees that now will be along where the detention is which is at the upper right-hand corner, the triangular area. That's the detention basin. Your ordinance requires heavy landscaping around it. We have done that, but we are also saving a number of trees over in that area as well as a number of trees down at the southeast corner of the development. Once again, if they're there and they're big and we clean them up and we make them good, they'll get good. So, we did not want to remove anything that we did not have to remove.

The final plan includes the 80 parking spaces that are required by your ordinance. The final plan includes the 10 percent handicap spaces that are required by IHDA. The final plan breaks up the parking into a number of small islands.

You have very strict fire requirements here. They require a 26-foot wide fire lane that extends on one long side of the building and around. This meets all of those requirements. The fire lane is unobstructed and extends along the south side of the building.

We've missed the light poles. We have our front yard, side yards, rear yard, in fact, we far exceed most of our yard setback requirements. There's even a canopy that sticks out over the entry and that doesn't stick out for more than the square footage that is permitted. In fact, it doesn't stick out at all over the square footage that's permitted to stick out onto the required yard.

We wanted to bring you something that we could stand here and say we are simply asking for two lots to become one, the lots to be consolidated, and that process then to take on a single zoning which gets rid of the commercial use that exists on an isolated parcel, and to allow us the chance to do an affordable housing project which is consistent with the new goals of the Village of Arlington Heights.

We have had the opportunity to get some feedback from comments that had been mailed into the Village. If I may now, what I'd like to do is to invite the traffic engineer up so that he can respond to those comments. Hopefully, that will give some answers

to questions that I believe are already here. We understand the traffic issues. So, since we already have some comments that are made, we would like to at least bring that forward at this point. Then I'll come back and conclude this.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sure.

MR. GREEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Take your time. I understand you were one of the ones previously sworn in, correct? Could you just state your name and spell your last name for the court reporter?

MR. MILLAN: Yes. Good evening. My name is Javier Millan, that's J-a-v-i-e-r, last name M-i-l-l-a-n. I'm a principal with KLOA, Incorporated, 9575 West Higgins Road, and we were retained to conduct the traffic study for the proposed development.

This traffic study was conducted following all industry guidelines. I'm going to try to briefly go over what the traffic study entailed and what we found.

So, as part of the traffic study, we conducted traffic counts at the intersections of Chestnut Avenue with Rand Road, Chestnut and Stonebridge Drive, the east and the west, east and westernmost access drives and the two access drives in between those drives. The counts were conducted in April of 2021 during the morning and evening peak periods.

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, at the time of the traffic counts, the traffic volumes in the study area do not reflect normal or typical conditions. As such, we compared those counts in April 2021 with previous counts conducted by us in 2015 at that intersection. We adjusted those 2015 traffic counts with growth factors provided to KLOA by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning to bring them up to 2021 conditions, normal conditions not pandemic conditions, and then we're able to compare both counts.

Based on the comparison, the weekday morning peak hour volumes were very, very similar, and the evening peak hour volumes were approximately 10 percent lower. So, as such, we increased the p.m. peak hour volumes in the area by 10 percent. I want to point out that this methodology of adjusting traffic volumes has been approved by the state, counties and other municipalities as it provides an acceptable data set.

Once we have the peak hours of traffic, we then proceeded to estimate the number of trips that the proposed development will generate during the peak hours. This is done using the Institute of Transportation Engineers, or ITE, trip generation manual, and this is the industry standard accepted by all public agencies and municipalities including the Village of Arlington Heights.

For analysis purposes, we actually, the traffic that will be generated by their proposed development was compared to the traffic that would be generated by a restaurant. Based on the comparison, the restaurant would generate significantly more traffic than their proposed residential development. So, in order to analyze, or sorry, in order to not analyze future conditions in a vacuum, the existing adjusted traffic volumes were increased to year 2027 projections. We utilized the growth factors that CMAP gave us and then bumped up those traffic volumes to 2027, and then to that background traffic volume, we added the traffic that will be generated by this development. We then conducted capacity analyses of all the study intersections to determine how well they are operating, and based on the results of the analyses, all of the intersections have enough reserve capacity to accommodate the projected year 2027 traffic volumes with minimal increases in the overall delay. This is due to the fact that

their proposed development is a very low traffic generator.

We also looked at the projected volumes at the intersection of Rand Road and Chestnut to see if a traffic signal will be warranted at that location. As you may be aware, Rand Road is an SRA, meaning strategic regional arterial, designated by the State of Illinois, and they have stricter guidelines in terms of providing a traffic signal. You would have to meet certain volume requirements in an hourly, eight hours of the day. Unfortunately, the volumes in here whether it's existing or projected do not meet those requirements and the state will not warrant the signal.

Lastly, as part of the traffic study, we also conducted a parking evaluation, and their proposed development meets the required number of parking spaces per Village of Arlington Heights code and exceeds the ITE peak parking demand that we calculated.

So, in summary, the development-generated traffic will add less than one percent of the traffic projected to be traversing the intersection of Rand Road and Chestnut during the peak hours. Their proposed access drives will be adequate in accommodating the load traffic projected to be generated by the development. Their proposed residential development will certainly generate significantly less traffic than a restaurant and, as such, will have a lower impact on the area roadways, and their proposed parking that will be provided will ensure that adequate parking is provided, meeting Village code, and exceeding or being able to accommodate the projected peak parking demand.

Any questions you might have, I'll be more than happy to answer them, but at this time, I'm going to turn it over to John.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Javier.

There are a few other things that I'd like to at least mention as we conclude this. One of them is that this property has sat vacant, so this will put this property back on producing property taxes at the level which it should be producing, and in our opinion, the residential level.

Secondly, the population for 40 units is projected to be low because it's one-bedrooms and two-bedrooms. It is a family, a non-age restricted facility, but it's been purposely designed for one-bedrooms and two-bedrooms. It minimizes any large family things and primarily will tend to attract people who are single, people who are living alone now. Even in the projections by the School District for its impact fees, the impact fees that we have to pay to the schools are relatively low because they recognize through their numbers that we will not be generating a lot of children to the development.

We will, however, be making a full contribution on all impact fees, and one of those is the Park District. There was a question that came to us earlier about the impact to the Park District with children that might be here, or actually a whole population. I'd like to think a lot of us go out and use the parks. We will be making the full impact fee payment to the Park District which in this case is the largest of the fees that will be paid, and that's over \$106,000. That's a relatively significant contribution to the Park District, and hopefully they would use some of that to help improve parks in this general area even though Arlington Heights has a phenomenal park system.

Lastly, I'd like to indicate that if you think of the super triangle, or that's what I've called it in my head, between Rand, Hintz and Arlington Heights Road, this is the last undeveloped parcel in that entire triangle. So, while we are bringing in a low population impact, and we believe a low overall impact, this is the last impact in this entire area. That

completes the triangle. We will be taking out a curb cut that's dangerous and bringing in a residential thing.

Somebody said to me somewhere along the process, well, what if people need to drive down over to the shopping center? I said, well, they can just cross the 25-foot ComEd thing and they're at the shopping center. Several times that I've been down to the site, I've noticed Stonebridge people taking the route. We don't intend to block the route, it's a nice route. We'll also be completing the walkway loop. There's a couple of gaps in there, and part of the requirements that were provided to us by the Staff were to complete those loops, and we are doing so.

We appreciate the time you've given us. We appreciate the patience of everybody sitting behind me. Believe me, it's not a lot of fun knowing you have to stand up in front of a lot of people and tell them, no, we're not really that bad, and I have to do it with my back to you. So, forgive me that my back is to you, it's just the way it's set up. We look forward to hearing the Staff report, so I'll report again no variations and we concur with everything the Staff report has said. Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you for your presentation, and I did hear you say that you had read the Staff report and that you do agree to all conditions of approval. If you could just confirm that for me?

MR. GREEN: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, terrific.

Staff report, please.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you, Chair Dawson.

So, the Petitioner is here before you this evening, as you heard, they want to develop a 40-unit multi-family project at 310 West Rand Road. That's at the southeast corner of Rand and Chestnut. The site is currently in two zoning districts: B-2 district for the majority of the site, that's where the existing asphalt pavement area is and that's the part that was formerly occupied by a restaurant close to 20 years ago; and then at the northeast section of the site there's a triangular portion as Chestnut begins to curve north that's in the R-6 Multiple-Family Dwelling District.

Similarly, the Comprehensive Plan designates the B-2 portion of the site as appropriate for commercial uses, and the R-6 portion as appropriate for moderate density multi-family uses. So, in order to obtain the necessary zoning to accomplish this development, the Petitioner needs three separate zoning actions. One would be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, and that's going to reclassify the commercial portion of the site into the moderate density multi-family site to align that with that portion in the northeast corner. The entirety of the site would then be within the modern density multi-family classification of the Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, the B-2 portion of the site needs to be rezoned to R-6, again uniting the entire site into the R-6 Multiple-Family Dwelling District. Finally, the site needs to be consolidated via a plat of subdivision so that it's all one lot. Currently, each separate zoning portion, the R-6 portion and the B-2 portion, are each on their own separate lot and they must be combined into one lot to accommodate for the development.

This evening, the Petitioner is only requesting preliminary plat of subdivision approval. Once they finalize their engineering and finalize their final plat, they will have to come back before the Plan Commission for approval of the final plat of subdivision.

There have been several committees and commissions and

meetings that the Petitioner has undertaken to get them to the point where they're at this evening. It started earlier this year on January 27th when they appeared in front of the Conceptual Plan Review Committee. At that time, the Conceptual Plan Review Committee didn't express any major concerns with that very preliminary concept. I think they were generally supportive of seeing the site redeveloped. They acknowledged that it was somewhat of a challenging site to develop given access issues and some of the neighboring uses, but they were very excited to entertain the prospect of redevelopment here.

They did encourage the Petitioner to hold a neighborhood meeting in advance of their appearance before the Plan Commission this evening, which the Petitioner did do. However, before they organized that meeting, they appeared in front of the Housing Commission, that was on March 2nd. They did receive a unanimous recommendation of approval from the Housing Commission.

There are some differences between the affordable component required by our Inclusionary Housing Ordinance and the amount of affordable housing that they are providing on the site. Specifically, the Village regulations require that two one-bedroom units be designated and rented at affordable levels in perpetuity, and two two-bedroom units also be designated and rented at affordable levels in perpetuity. So, that's only four out of the 40 units within the development, that's what the Village Code requires as a minimum. The remaining units are elected to be rented at those affordable levels by the Petitioner.

There's different requirements between the Petitioner's length of affordability and the Village's for those four units. The Village requires those units be held and rented at affordable levels in perpetuity. My understanding from the developer's lending requirements, they are only required to have those remaining 36 units rented at affordable levels for a period of 30 years. That being said, they still received the unanimous recommendation of approval from the Housing Commission in March, and then later that month the Petitioner held a neighborhood meeting via Zoom for residents in the surrounding community.

According to the Petitioner, there were some general questions about traffic movements through the Chestnut and Rand Road intersection. The Petitioner stated that they would be working with a traffic consultant to prepare a traffic analysis and parking analysis and would take those considerations and concerns into consideration.

Then on May 11th, they appeared in front of the Design Commission and also received a unanimous recommendation of approval of the architecture and design for the site. There were several conditions of approval attached to that recommendation, and the Petitioner has incorporated all of those changes required by the Design Commission into the plans that went before the Plan Commission this evening. So, all of the proposed plans and development are compliant with the Design Commission recommendation.

When Staff analyzed the request for rezoning and amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, we looked towards the goals and objectives contained within the Comprehensive Plan, and we did find that this rezoning and development met several of those goals and objectives in the Comprehensive Plan and they're listed here. One of the general goals of the Comprehensive Plan is to promote affordable housing for various income levels and housing types. Certainly, this proposed development hits that goal to a T.

Additionally, there is a recommendation to encourage a wide variety of housing alternatives by type size and price range. The Petitioner has gone through in detail the programming within their building. It does provide housing options that are not readily, or

widely available in the community, so we felt that this development met that goal as well. Additionally, they will be providing a wide variety of housing for young, elderly, disabled, and single households including rental housing. This development is a fully rental housing development, so it does again provide this housing option that's not widely available in the community.

Finally, there are several sustainable elements that they are proposing within the development. They have committed to obtaining a National Green Building Bronze status. They'll have Energy Star appliances and exhaust systems, and that is compatible with one of the goals in the Comprehensive Plan, which is to promote and encourage energy efficiency for residential and commercial buildings.

So, relative to the rezoning, the Comprehensive Plan amendment, and the preliminary plat of subdivision approval, the Staff Development Committee is supportive of those zoning actions and is recommending approval subject to several conditions which I will get into at the end of this presentation.

So, again here is the aerial of the site. You can see the subject property in the center. It's bounded by that red line, red box here. To the north, you've heard, the multi-family Stonebridge Apartment development. To the east is the ComEd substation. At the south is the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center. Then directly across the street, there are some townhome developments.

Rand Road is a major arterial that runs adjacent to the site. It is under IDOT control. Chestnut Avenue here is classified as a local street in the Village's Thoroughfare Plan. As has been noted, there is existing access to the site from Rand Road that will be eliminated as part of this development. The new access points to the site will be approximately here, and then again, a little farther east, approximately in this location.

Here's the site plan for the development. Again, there are no variations needed as part of this development request. But certainly, the Village preference, when we see a redevelopment on what we consider to be a green site, an undeveloped site, it's not always common to see redevelopment proposals that do not require any variations. But this plan does not require any variations.

At the northeast of the site, there is a proposed detention basin. This has been designed as a dry bottom detention basin so it's not going to be holding water for everyday of the year. Certainly, during heavy rain events it will hold water, potentially for a day or two, depending on the severity of the rain event, but it is designed to slowly percolate into the ground and enter into the stormwater system.

There are 80 parking spaces proposed on the site. There are 80 parking spaces required by code. So, this development meets the parking standards of the Village.

Again, here you see the landscape plan. One of the requests that Staff made when evaluating this proposal was to provide a dense buffer to the east abutting the ComEd substation, and then again at the south abutting the commercial uses of the Arlington Plaza Shopping Center. The Petitioner does exceed code requirements for landscaping in many areas. Along the east of the site, they are proposing up to 17 new trees, it will be a mix of evergreen and deciduous trees. Then on the south, they are proposing many shrubs and 20 trees, again a mix of evergreens and deciduous trees, and they are preserving one existing maple tree in that area.

Around the detention basin, there is a heavily landscaped buffer which is a code requirement. They have, you know, added additional plantings at the request of Staff, and we feel that the detention area is very well landscaped and goes beyond code requirements as well.

You did hear the Petitioner discuss a transformer that was originally proposed in this location. At the request of Staff, they moved the transformer here and they have extended a wing wall of the building to screen that element. They will need to make adjustments to their landscape plan as they move forward to permit to reflect that adjusted location. You can see the landscaping is still designed to accommodate for that original location of the transformer here. But that's certainly something we'll be able to work with them on as they finalize their plans for a building permit should this project receive approval.

As required by code, they did submit a photometric plan for review. Under our review, we did note that on the east side property line where the site abuts the ComEd substation, some of the photometric levels appear to exceed code requirements. It was a very, very minor excess of code requirements. I think it was 0.3-foot candles where the maximum level of foot candles is 0.1 where a property abuts a residential zoning district. Even though there are no residential uses occurring at the ComEd substation, it is zoned within a residential zoning district, so those standards do apply. As a condition of approval, we have requested that the Petitioner provide a revised code-compliant photometric plan as part of their final plat of subdivision submission for review and approval by Staff.

Relative to traffic and parking, there's not too much more I can add beyond the KLOA study and presentation you heard this evening. Again, they studied existing traffic volumes, adjusted it for regional growth factors, compared it to previous studies in the area to account for any lower COVID values experienced during the pandemic. Generally, they found the peak travel times in this area were between 7:15 and 8:15 in the morning, and then again between 4:45 and 5:45 in the evening. According to the traffic analysis and based on the ITE estimations for traffic generation, they estimated that during that evening peak, I'm sorry, that morning peak hour, this proposed development would generate approximately 14 additional car trips on Chestnut. That equates to about one car every four minutes. Again, in the evening peak hour, an additional 18 vehicle trips which equates to one car every three minutes on average.

We were concerned, excuse me, we were concerned with the intersection of Chestnut and Rand Road because there is no traffic signal in this area. It's under stop sign control on both legs, the Techny Road leg and the Chestnut Avenue leg. So, we were concerned that, you know, we wanted to make sure that the traffic study and Petitioner had evaluated the impact to this intersection to make sure that they weren't creating an unsafe traffic situation. Specifically, as cars are lining up and queuing here waiting to make a left turn, we wanted to make sure that there wasn't a stacking issue that would, you know, reach back farther down Chestnut Avenue and create an unsafe situation for cars trying to enter Chestnut Avenue from the adjacent driveway entrances.

The study found that during peak times, about five percent of the time the stacking here would project out about 90 feet. That would get it just about to the entrance of the Stonebridge Apartment facility, their westernmost entrance. This would only occur, as estimated, about five percent of the time during very heavy traffic situations. Staff notes that there are other alternative means for access into Stonebridge, that should this

stacking be a, you know, a problem at limited times during the morning or evening peak hour, that residents do have alternative options for ingress and egress into the Stonebridge Apartments. The proposed driveway entrance to this development, you know, the stacking is not anticipated to reach back there, so we don't anticipate that to be a problem. But again, there is an alternative means of ingress and egress to the subject property as well.

You heard about the potential for cut-through traffic, people that, you know, may be heading southbound, southeast bound on Rand Road, and instead of going all the way down to the Arlington Heights Road intersection to make a left north on Arlington Heights Road, they may opt instead to cut through on Chestnut and head up through the residential neighborhood. This development, you know, will certainly have people doing that, you know, but the traffic study estimated that only five percent of the traffic flow would really utilize that area. That equates to, you know, one car during the morning peak and one car during the evening peak. So, we don't expect this to have a substantial or undue traffic impact for that movement.

So, to conclude the Staff report, we are recommending approval of this application subject to several conditions. I will note that there has been a last minute change to one of the conditions within the Staff report, and really it's not a substantive change. It's really more to provide additional specificity. The motion sheets in front of the Plan Commission do reflect that. So, the original recommended condition of approval was just to generally require compliance with the March 2nd Housing Commission motion. The revised condition is basically just to specify what that March 2nd motion from the Housing Commission was. Again, there's really no substantive change here, it's just additional specificity added.

So, that will conclude the presentation this evening, and happy to answer questions.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Great. Thank you, Sam.

Do I have a motion to include the Staff report into the public record?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'll move to accept the Staff report into the record.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Second?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I'll second that.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, motion carries.

All right, at this time, do we have any initial questions for the Petitioner or Staff before we open for public commentary? We started down there last time.

Okay, Commissioner Lorenzini?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I'll wait to hear from the public.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: I have a question for Staff.

Sam, maybe you can answer this. Our Housing Commission has 60 percent of the Area Median Income requirement. Where does the 30 percent come from?

MR. HUBBARD: The 30 percent is the Petitioner's proposal, that's what their, I believe their lending requirements require. It's not a Village requirement. Our threshold is that 60 percent.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, basically, they can do whatever they want

in that, I would assume?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, I mean, you may have to ask the Petitioner, but I mean, I think they have lending requirements that would require a certain percentage of the units be rented at those 30 percent or less levels.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Because of the state funds they're using?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe that to be so, yes.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Ah, okay. That was it. No other question.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Drost, any question?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Now, does this have any similarity to the Park Side development that was on Eastman and that was developed on Eastman and Dunton? So, kind of putting it into perspective that this isn't our first effort at affordable housing. Are there any other locations that we have considered?

MR. HUBBARD: So, the Parkview Apartments.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Parkview, excuse me.

MR. HUBBARD: It did utilize low income housing tax credits for their development. So, it's the same funding stream that the Petitioner is accessing for this development as well.

COMMISSIONER DROST: So, you know, we won't have to ask the funding questions and the financing, so it's similar to what Parkview did. Good, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I have a question for the developer.

If Mr. Zunamon, am I pronouncing your name right?

MR. ZUNAMON: Zunamon.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Zunamon, I apologize. So, you're developing and managing this property?

MR. ZUNAMON: We're developing it, we're owning it. We're going to third party manage it. In Florida, we manage everything, in-house management. But in our first, you know, foray here into Illinois, we're going to third party manage with a group called Carefree Management that our nonprofit partner has utilized on other developments. Again, just to be very clear, I mean, when we build these developments, you know, we own them long term. This is not a we build it and somehow we're going to flip it to somebody else. So, we have a very vested interest to make it successful and frankly to have the best, you know, potential tenants so that we have minimal problems, just like anybody else that operates their business.

I mean, we're private developers working with a non-profit group to build this. So, hopefully that --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, so, well, then I misunderstood. I thought you had indicated that there were a number of these types of properties that you've developed in the Chicago Metropolitan areas outside. Are you just looking at properties?

MR. ZUNAMON: No, our non-profit partner, Turnstone, they have developed a lot of properties in Illinois. So, we, as our, you know, kind of entering this market, decided to partner with them so we have kind of best of both worlds. So, if that was confusing, yes, our company out of Florida, we're one of the, you know, top national firms in the country. I'm initially from Illinois, so bringing my family back here, it made sense to partner with local experts and bring those two forces together.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, and, well, what my main question is in that regard is what, in the case of Florida, but in Illinois you're going to use a third-party

manager. What does, do they have a management person on site? There's a document that's referred to in your papers a number of times and it's called the, what is it, it's the review form that you use for tenants to qualify them.

MR. ZUNAMON: I guess I'm not clear on the question.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Well, what is that process?

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes, so in that process, you know, to kind of sidebar with the question about the percentage, when we do these developments, most of them are 60 percent and under.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

MR. ZUNAMON: This development only has eight of the 42, or 40 units, excuse me, are at the 30 percent AMI. Basically, when we, you know, are awarded these tax credits from the state, we go out and we work with big banks like Bank of America, Chase, BMO Harris, whoever, and they buy those credits from us to build these developments. So, we stick around them long term, and when we do the third-party management or we manage ourselves, everybody's got to do a thorough credit check, background check, police report, all those kind of things.

On top of that, I know that, you know, there's been questions about, hey, how much do folks make? So, you know, we're talking about people for a one-bedroom making \$40,000 or less. If it was four people in a two-bedroom which would be the max and why again we don't expect there to be, you know, these huge families, that's a family making about \$55K or under. That's just the top end threshold, you have to make that or less. But as a more, you know, kind of stringent threshold, everybody's got to make at least 2.5 times the rent because obviously we don't want to set people up for not success and moving in and not being able to afford.

So, all the things that you would expect when you're trying to go through a typical rental process at any other property, we do that and frankly more, because not just, we have to do compliance. We hire typically a third-party compliance expert. Our banks have in-house compliance folks. It's to no one's interest to see these not be successful long-term.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, so as you've said, you hire a third-party management company that uses this tenant preference form. Is there any advantage given to Arlington Heights residents or people working right in the area?

MR. ZUNAMON: I mean, that's probably against fair housing to do it like that. But definitely, every best effort will be made to, you know, speak with HUD and whatever guidelines there could be to make it more towards Arlington Heights, but I think from a legal standpoint, we couldn't do that. But obviously, from a practical standpoint, you know, the marketing efforts will be local, grassroots, work with the Village, and make sure that folks that are in Arlington Heights that obviously need this kind of housing after the pretty terrible year that we all just experienced are able to stay in their community and have a lot of extra income frankly to, you know, hopefully this is a temporary thing that, you know, happened because of the pandemic and are able to advance and get back to, you know, wherever else they'd like to move.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, we've had a number of developments that have either had a minimum number of affordable housing units or, in your case, you're the second developer that's coming in that will have the entire building affordable. How do, you

provide an annual report to the Village, is that correct, on the income of the various tenants?

MR. ZUNAMON: I'm not aware of a Village requirement to do that, but if, I mean, typically it doesn't work in that fashion. I guess I'm not following exactly where --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Sam, is that a requirement?

MR. HUBBARD: For the four units that the Village requires to be rented at affordable levels, we do require reporting from the --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: But the rest of them aren't?

MR. HUBBARD: For the rest of them, they just have their independent reporting requirements from the --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I was just backing into some of these numbers, and at 30 percent with the rent, if the rent has to be 30 percent of their income, and you backed it in. You're talking about somebody that's making \$15,000 a year?

MR. ZUNAMON: I'm not clear on for which units, because basically --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That would be like the rent on some of your one-bedrooms are \$381 if I'm, I don't have it right in front of me but that's what I recall.

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes. So, to be clear, this is a 40-unit development. Eight of the units will be rented to folks that make, you know, \$381, but for the rest of the one-bedrooms, it's going to be at \$880.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Wait, that's the rent, not what they would make.

MR. ZUNAMON: Correct, the rent.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, that's 30 percent of what they would make.

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Or potentially, okay.

MR. ZUNAMON: Well, for eight of the units, and again, I mean, I think there's probably a lot of people that could really benefit from that. But the majority of the community is going to be making it at the 60 percent AMI, that's part of the Comprehensive Plan. Those rents for the one-bedroom will be \$880, and for the two-bedroom will be about \$1,050.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, and you're saying the four units that are in perpetuity, the rest of the units will just stay that way for 30 years?

MR. ZUNAMON: Well, they have what's called a land use restriction or some kind of extended use agreement, a legal instrument to ensure that that takes place. At the end of the 30 years, they could convert to market rate or, frankly, we as owners could continue to keep them affordable. But that's, in effect, the land use, you know, document that the state requires and there's no reason we couldn't keep them for longer. That's just the minimum requirement.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, that's all I have for right now. Thank you.

MR. ZUNAMON: All right, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Sigalos?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes, I don't really have anything at this point. I'd like to hear what the residents, the audience may have.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, I have a --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Can we turn the lights on?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sure, why are our lights off? Good grief.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Well, maybe for the screen.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I have a question about the condition on the

photometric plan. I don't know who related to the Petitioner would have information about your photometric plan. So, I see that there is a condition that would require you to come back with a photometric plan that conforms. Now, again this is preliminary, so it's not quite the same as if, you know, you could come back and ask for a variance, but I just wanted some information about the plan.

Given that it's abutting the ComEd facility and not a residential area, and also given that this is lighting your parking lot and then therefore light would be a safety issue for your residents, and appropriate lighting, so I wanted to understand.

MR. GREEN: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Is this an issue for you with respect to safety?

MR. GREEN: No, not at all. Actually, we just have to point the light, the one light fixture a little bit further to the west. I think it's kind of funny that the light is spilling over on to ComEd.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right, it is.

MR. GREEN: But it is not an issue for us at all.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, I just wanted to make sure, because if it was a safety issue, then I wanted to engage in a discussion about whether or not we should allow some sort of waiver or open it up to allow some sort of waiver because I want your residents to be safe.

MR. GREEN: Two-tenths of a foot candle at one spot, that's it.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, great, that answers that. Then I just wanted to talk a little bit, Sam, about maybe for the benefit of the audience, I don't know if they have any questions about this, but I did note in the, which is no longer the Plat and Sub Commission, but there was talk about the perpetuity issue. When we say in perpetuity, could you just explain for everyone that someone could 50 years down the road come in and ask for a modification to that. It's not set in stone. I mean, we're not talking about for the next 500 years, right? I mean, there is in theory a process that we could follow?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. I mean, yes, the Village could change our code which requires that, you know, in perpetuity clause so to speak but, you know, it may require an amendment to the, you know, to this approval as well. But, I mean, in theory, you know, yes, anything could be changed in the future.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right, okay. I just wanted to make that clear. Perpetuity sounds very permanent, it doesn't have to be. There is a process, requires public commentary and all of that, but I noted that Jay who is not here had stated in that, one of his comments was that he felt that that was unnecessary. I just wanted to address the fact that things can change.

Okay, so with that, seeing no more comments before we open the public commentary, correct?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, we are going to open the public commentary. Before we start this process, it's helpful to me to know so we know how to be calling people up to the microphone, by raise of hands, I'm not holding you to it, who is planning on speaking?

(Show of hands.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, great. So, it's pretty even on the two

sides, so we'll probably go row by row. Obviously, respect, I know we're all in person but try to respect social distancing as you're passing. So, I can start here and we can move along the row.

Anybody here on this front row that wishes to speak? Okay, I had you raise hands, I've already forgotten what rows you were all in. Okay, second row, who over here in the second row would like to speak?

Okay, before you speak, we ask that you state your first and last name, and spell your last name. We also ask that you provide your address but that is optional to you. It does allow the Commissioners to have a better understanding of your commentary.

QUESTIONS FROM AUDIENCE

MR. ZYCK: No, absolutely, thank you. Thank you for your time. My name is Greg Zyck, the last name is spelled Z-y-c-k. Actually my address is pertinent to this conversation. I live at 17 West Waverly Road, which Waverly Road is if you go up Chestnut, it's about two blocks north of where this development is.

Being a past member actually of the Housing Commission, I actually applaud the Petitioner on what they're trying to do here and on their mission, that it's actually a great thing. I think it's a good thing for the neighborhood, too, for our community.

Also, this land has been an eyesore for a while. I've been there since 1999, and it's just been an eyesore. It's been opened I think the entire time I've been there. It's actually become more of a truck stop lately than it has anything. So, doing something with this land is something that's good. I think one of the big things that you're talking about is to combine the zoning between the two of those, and personally I think it would be a great thing to do because I think it would make it easier to do something with this land.

The issue though that I have, there's actually a couple of them. First of all, I just have to make the one statement about the public meeting that was talked about. According to the report, there was three people that went to it. For many of us, this was the first meeting that we've heard about this particular situation, so my guess is that not enough people knew about the situation in order to give our thoughts.

(Applause.)

MR. ZYCK: So, this is the first time you've going to be hearing a lot of these thoughts tonight or anybody in the Village is going to be hearing a lot of these thoughts.

The big issue has to do with the traffic, and I respect that the traffic study was done. I understand the models that were probably used. But being there since 1999, I've seen the traffic that goes through here. One of the things that wasn't discussed and wasn't shown on the maps is actually you come in from, what happens a lot of times is Waverly Road comes directly off of Arlington Heights Road and it is an access point into that whole subdivision area. Living there on that road, I put up with that and I know what I'm in for when I'm there, that I'm going to have traffic that's cutting through. But what happens a lot is they come up Chestnut, they come over to Waverly and they go out to Arlington Heights road, or vice versa and they come through. So, there is a good amount of traffic that goes through that area already.

I know they're saying that there's not going to be very much more. I have a hard time believing that because there's enough traffic going through there right now. Matter of fact, it's funny, just this week I was thinking about, or not thinking about, I was going to

call the Village because lately Waverly Road has become a little bit more of a racetrack than it should. They've tried to stop it and in times past they had cameras out there and everything but there's still a lot of traffic there that's going through there. So, there is already an issue that's going on, at least with my road particularly and coming up to Chestnut.

This is only going to take it, make it worse. I do respect that they said it's going to be less than a restaurant. Yes, I have no doubt about that because you've got traffic coming in and out there all the time, it wouldn't be like that. But our feeling is that it's going to be more. So, please take that in consideration. I don't know if that's in the purview of this Commission, but I hope it's something that the Village does take into account when they're considering all of this.

One point that I also, looking at that map and showing coming off of Chestnut on to Rand, they've showed a left turn and a right turn. What it didn't show was going straight across, and that happens quite a bit. There is nothing, that is not a right-turn only or a left-turn, well, there's a left-turn only. That is not a right-turn only lane. It can go straight across. So, what happens is traffic does go across that quite a bit. So, now you're adding more cars into that.

It's a dangerous situation. Trust me being somebody who's risked that going straight across more times than I probably should have, it's going to become more of an issue there when you've got 80 spots there and 40 units there, too. So, that's all I had, but please take in consideration traffic is going to be an issue. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Greg, can I ask you a question?

MR. ZYCK: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: So, you're talking about the, Chestnut lines up with the drive next to the auto repair shop across the street?

MR. ZYCK: Techny. You have to come a little bit farther northwest, isn't it?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sam, could you put the aerial up perhaps?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: That would be helpful.

MR. ZYCK: Okay, so if you see the --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Oh, okay, that's a, yes, block a little bit away.

MR. ZYCK: Right there, okay, come across there, that's Techny. That's Techny right across there, and people shoot across that street all the time and they go through that whole area and try to get over to Palatine Road.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right.

MR. ZYCK: Both ways. Both ways, yes.

(Audience members put forth some comments.)

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Well, that is a legitimate --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, we need to keep commentary to the person at the podium. You'll have opportunity to come speak.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Could I ask a question, too?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Just to follow-up.

MR. ZYCK: Sure.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: So, when you say you want us and the Village Board to take that into consideration, what are you suggesting? Deny the proposal or what do

you want to have happen?

MR. ZYCK: As I said before, it's an eyesore. I mean, we want to see something done. I want to see something done with this. This to me is a step too far as far as the traffic goes. I totally respect and I'm not trying to diss anybody as far as the work that they've done on traffic study. That's not part of this. But living in that neighborhood and just knowing that you're now going to be adding that many more cars to that area, it is going to increase traffic. Whether it's one percent or whether it's X amount of percent, it is going to be adding to that area. That area does have a good amount of traffic already and it is already something that's dangerous as it is.

So, yes, I guess as you've put me on the spot here, which I appreciate, yes, at this particular point I probably would be against this development.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, and you'd prefer maybe a restaurant?

MR. ZYCK: No, I do not want a restaurant. I do not want a restaurant there.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, but that probably could go in there without much review --

MR. ZYCK: But it could be, what about single-family housing or something to that effect?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, all those would require review, but if you put a restaurant in there, it's not sure how much additional review has to happen. So, you might not even have the input on that that you have now.

MR. ZYCK: I'm not sure I understand the point, sir.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, if it doesn't change use, it was a restaurant, so it may not need the kind of review that this is getting because they're changing the use. So, you might encourage a restaurant to be there and not have the kind of input you're having now.

Is that a choice you'd like?

MR. ZYCK: I understand where you're going to. I guess I would appreciate, if the Village is going to do something like that, it gives us more notice of what is going to go on than say that the public meeting was back in March, for us to at least discuss and have our voice in what's going on.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Well, I appreciate your answers. That helps me clarify what you're asking. Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Sam, on this, two quick questions. One, whose responsibility is it to send out the notices on the public meeting?

MR. HUBBARD: So, on the neighborhood meeting, the Petitioner sends out those notices.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: The Petitioner does.

MR. HUBBARD: Both for the neighborhood meeting and this public hearing.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Nobody got those notices and they were supposed --

(Chorus of noes from the audience members.)

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Oh, okay. The other question is what we're proposing here is two drives in and out on to Chestnut as opposed to the drive that used to be

out on to Rand Road. Has the state, why are we taking the ingress and egress off of Rand Road? Is that a state requirement?

MR. HUBBARD: Well, I mean, it was what the Petitioner proposed. I think that any, if IDOT would allow, you know, a curb cut in that location, certainly it would be right-in and right-out only, and I don't know if that's something the Petitioner was interested in. I mean, I think you'd have to hear that from them why they designed it that way.

I think it would be a tough approval from IDOT. I think that, you know, it's in close proximity to the Chestnut and Techny intersection, so, you know, there's a good chance that IDOT may not even allow access there, it's possible.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Anymore? I'm just thinking if there weren't two drives on Chestnut, I would think that would cut down some of the traffic on Chestnut, okay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, and if you were to down-zone it to residential, you know, you're doing R-3, you might get more houses there than you would get units. Right, Sam? 0.46 acres.

MR. HUBBARD: Probably not.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Oh, you're looking at --

MR. HUBBARD: Probably not. You're probably looking at, you know, around 20 single-family homes if not less.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, with more bedrooms though.

MR. HUBBARD: Potentially.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so I mean, what I'm trying to get to is if you're down-zoning, your use may be comparable, looking at single-family.

MR. HUBBARD: I don't think this is a great site for single-family use --

COMMISSIONER DROST: Well, that's another question, but I'm just doing, trying to compare some apples and apples here, you know, from the standpoint of, you know, be careful what you wish for type.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you.

MR. ZYCK: All right, thank you.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I have one question regarding the public response of the --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: John, is your, for this individual or is it just a general? Can we let him sit down?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: No, just a general, not for this individual. No, I'm sorry.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, it's okay.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Regarding the notice of a public meeting, it sounds like unanimously here no one got a notice. What is the requirement? 250-foot radius? Is that for a notice to be published?

MR. HUBBARD: For the public hearing this evening, it's a 250-foot radius requirement.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: But not for a public meeting?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: For the neighborhood meeting.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Neighborhood meeting I mean.

MR. HUBBARD: For the neighborhood meeting, there is no, I mean, it's not a code requirement. It's a strong recommendation that Staff makes. We typically make, we ask

that the same properties that would be required to be noticed for this public hearing also be invited to that neighborhood meeting.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Right.

MR. HUBBARD: It's my understanding that they went beyond what was required for the, you know, public hearing radius.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: How were the notices posted for the public, or neighborhood meeting?

MR. GREEN: I can give you those answers. They are required to be sent via regular mail. They were sent via regular mail. The Staff provided us with the list of those that would be required to be notified for the public hearing tonight, and that was 44, I believe it was 44, it might have been 43 properties that fall within the 250 feet. We went to 500 feet. We sent out notices to 97 homes.

This first gentleman who came up, from the address he gave me, I'm going to guess he's 700 to 800 feet away. So, we went twice the distance that was required and notified twice as many people as were required. We did make an outreach. We got zero of those 90-some mailings back.

On this one for public notice, we had to send out the 43 or 44. We got one back, and it was just, I think somebody had moved. We re-sent it so that we made sure we were covering the notices and covering more than was required.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: John, before you leave, does that include the Commonwealth Edison right-of-way?

MR. GREEN: Right-of-ways are excluded.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: So, you went to the other side of the property and then went 250 or 500 feet?

MR. GREEN: Yes, we had to go, we had to do that. In fact, for Rand and every other street, we had to go 250 minus right-of-ways.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, so second row over here, anybody wish to speak in the second row?

(No response.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, so we're going to third -- oh, we didn't finish your second row, sorry. I thought nobody else was standing up. So, there we go.

MRS. ZYCK: My name is Krista Zyck, I'm Greg's wife, Z-y-c-k, 17 West Waverly Road. I will echo, I will agree with what he said, the traffic study is not correct.

One of the problems is without the high school being in session, we have lots of high school kids who cut over to get to Buffalo Grove. So, I totally disagree with that study that was made. I also agree that going across from Techny is a dangerous situation. It's just going to be worse because people are just going to continue to back up over there, trying to go across that way.

I would say I would personally prefer a restaurant. I don't agree that the traffic would be worse with a restaurant because people going to a restaurant are there all different times of the day coming and going. It's not people are going to the restaurant only in the morning, only in the evening. But when it's a home, it's more likely you're going to go at certain hours in the morning to go to work and certain hours to go home from work. So, that

would just be my opinion. I would prefer a restaurant. I do not agree with this building the way it's proposed.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Could I ask a question. It relates to what Mrs. Zyck said, but I think I'm asking it --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: But is it for Staff or could we allow her to sit down?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: She can sit down, yes.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I guess my question is this. We have some traffic going through this shortcut. I used to live in that neighborhood, so I'm aware of it. I used to live on Brookwood. But are we to focus on the flow of traffic that goes through there whether this development is there or not, or are we to focus on the addition that this would make to that traffic? Because I don't think we can hold the Petitioner responsible for all of the cut-through traffic that goes on whether they're there or not. So, the issue is do they add significantly to the traffic that's cutting through there? Am I framing that correctly, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: Right. The existing, you know, backups on Chestnut or cut-through traffic is an existing condition obviously without this development. So, what we from a Staff perspective and what the Plan Commission should look to is, you know, is the traffic that will be generated by this development in addition to what's already there, is that, you know, the straw that will break the camel's back so to speak? You know, this development cannot address the existing cut-through traffic that already goes through there and, you know, it's not responsible for the backups that already may occur on Chestnut. It's just what is the impact from this development to that existing situation, and is the impact from this development going to be, you know, create an even further unsafe situation that's undue.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Is there any place that the residents can go to get a little relief for what's happening there now, whether this development is approved or not? Obviously, they have a condition that they're not very happy with, and there is traffic there which I was aware of when I lived in that area. Is there any place they can go to the Village or somewhere to get some relief or something that helps with that flow of traffic? Which really has nothing to do with the Petitioner at this point.

MR. HUBBARD: I mean, the intersection of Chestnut and Techny and Rand is under IDOT control. So, the Village, you know, can't install a traffic signal there unless IDOT wants that to happen and agrees that the necessary warrants have been met. But certainly, you know, I can reach out to our Engineering Department and see what, you know, communications and options there may be for any improvements to the traffic here.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Okay, just to summarize that, we're to focus on the addition that this development would make to the traffic, not the overall flow of traffic through there.

MR. HUBBARD: Correct.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I have a follow-up question to that. So, Sam, the additional traffic this will bring, does it change the level of service of that road or that intersection?

MR. HUBBARD: Under future conditions, there is a change to the level of

service. I believe, I'd have to go back to the traffic study. I mean, it was already functioning at either an E or F and it would continue to function that way, or go from an E to an F. The level of delay in seconds was about a one to three-second additional delay, but I do believe it did kick up one of those level of services from E to F, but I'd have to confirm that with the traffic study.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: But it wasn't enough to warrant a traffic light with IDOT?

MR. HUBBARD: No, per the volumes observed and from the traffic consultant, yes, they don't believe that the warrants would be met from IDOT.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Okay, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you.

Anybody else on that row?

MS. SIKORA: Hello, Eileen Sikora, S-i-k-o-r-a. I also live on Waverly Raceway. I've lived there for 29 years now, and I do want to ask one question because I don't know the legal rules. But has Arlington Heights already achieved their affordable housing limit or whatever percentage they need? That's just a rhetorical question, I don't know what the numbers are. Have we achieved it already? Do we need this in our community?

There is also another affordable housing development about a mile and a half away toward Dundee Road. I don't know if anybody knows that. We have a lot of that in the northern part of Arlington Heights.

There was a restaurant right at that corner you're talking about, at Rand and Chestnut. A little pizza place, it was very nice. People were really sad when it left. It would be nice to have another restaurant there for that community.

The Board approved a church right at Chestnut and Waverly last year or the year before. So, we have additional traffic in the neighborhood from a church that has gone in there recently. It's the same thing that they said already, it's the traffic down there which doesn't really have to do with this development.

But you have to know how bad it is. I've been passed on my own street trying to turn into my own driveway. It's bad. It's not good. It's amazing, I've seen little kids being pulled back by their parent from the ball field and the park because a car is whizzing down there. Something has to be stopped for that. I'm sorry. Thanks for listening.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Anybody else in that row?

MS. GALSTER: I live in that area, I live down in Brookwood.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: State your name.

MS. GALSTER: Oh, I'm sorry. My name is Gail Galster, it's G-a-l-s-t-e-r. The first name is Gail, G-a-i-l.

I live in that area. I am not aware of anybody that, and we've put out a lot of feelers about this for tonight, and people just heard about this in the last couple of weeks. So, I am not aware of anybody that was notified for that neighborhood meeting because people who live on Appletree would have communicated to people in the surrounding area, and that didn't happen. So, I mean, you should just be aware that there's a lot of people in the few blocks that are surrounding that corridor with Chestnut-Waverly, and Chestnut all the way down through Suffield and Hintz that people are affected.

Also, I talked to Sam today who was very, very helpful, answered a lot of questions, but one of my questions was about the School District. Does the School District even get informed about a project like this? Because I think that Ivy Hill is at a pretty high

capacity now. Then, you know, he mentioned that the one and two-bedroom apartments will not have a lot of people in them, you know, children feeding into the schools. So, I'm wondering about this, you know, the petition to rent an apartment, how detailed it gets and are there limits?

I mean, in my day, four kids slept in a bedroom. So, you know, you can have a one-bedroom where parents, somebody's sleeping in the dining area. I mean, I really want to know, and I don't have children in the schools now, I mean, I'm just concerned. I'm concerned about the density, I'm concerned about the schools, and particularly of course about the traffic, too. I walk the neighborhood all the time at different hours, and I can tell you that there is an existing problem. But that area, I also see the school buses pick up, I'm walking in the morning when the school buses are picking up, and I'm trying to figure out how they'll be blocking Chestnut or where they will go to pick up children from that development.

It's a real concern because people are turning in and out of Rand Road very close to where those driveways are. So, I mean, that's just something to keep in mind. So, density, the schools, and the traffic, that pretty much encompasses my concerns.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

Sam, do you want to speak to the school being notified?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes. We don't notify the School District when we receive an application to move forward unless it's, you know, an extremely dense development that we expect to generate a lot of children. On a 40-unit multi-family development with one and two-bedroom units; we don't expect this to generate a whole lot of children. It certainly, you know, will generate some children.

I would note that, you know, the Ivy Hill School completed an expansion in 2016 to, you know, as a result of, you know, forecasted projections of enrollment increases. The Plan Commission probably recalls that project as it went before the Plan Commission. Then in 2017, Thomas Middle School also went through an expansion to increase capacity in expectations for increasing enrollments. So, again, you know, the development will also contribute as you've heard, you know, impact fees to the School District to, you know, help accommodate for any impact felt from this development.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you. I wanted to make another comment about the comment about there being a lot of affordable housing in the north. Does the Village have any type of map that shows where all of the affordable housing units are located throughout that you're aware of? If you're not aware, I would presume the Housing, so I'm a former member and former Chair of the Housing Commission, and we had a map of all of those. So, there might be something.

I think that many people might be surprised where the affordable housing is located. It's right over there, it's right downtown. It's right all over the Village. So, that might be something of interest to see, it's not just located along to the north.

Okay, so anybody else in this row? Yes, sir.

MR. GALSTER: My name is Sheldon Galster, G-a-l-s-t-e-r, 25 West Brookwood. I don't know the protocol. Can I ask the developers questions, or do I have to pose the question to you?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: You would propose it to us and then we would propose it, yes.

MR. GALSTER: Okay, so, one, my wife brought up about the buses. So, have they decided where buses would go? If they stop on Chestnut, when they put out that stop

sign, traffic is going to back up both ways no matter how many cars come in, right? So, I don't know if there's room for buses to go into the complex and come out, or if they're going to be on Chestnut.

The other question I have that I'd like to ask you is I didn't see any recreation area for children to play in the complex. So, where are they going to go? I mean, they could play in the retention pond, but I'm not sure that's the best play to go for kids even though I've seen that in many places.

The other thing is about traffic. I understand the addition but there was a study and he said, the traffic engineer said in 2015, I'd like to know why there was a traffic study then because there's been no movement in that. Why was there one done? Since 2015, there's an app called Waze that's come aboard that sends people down Chestnut to Waverly to get off Arlington Heights Road and vice versa. So, that's increased the traffic tremendously there.

I had one other issue and I don't remember what it was. So, maybe if I'll be allowed to come back and I think about it, I'll --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Unfortunately, no. This is your chance to give us commentary. Once you sit down --

MR. GALSTER: Okay, I could stay here then and filibuster like --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, we also, there are limits where we just try not enforce them.

MR. GALSTER: Okay, I'm only kidding.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right.

MR. GALSTER: Let's see. Quite a few years ago when we first moved in here, there was a proposal for this same property for a condo development. I don't know if it was the Plan Commission or the actual Board denied that because of density issues. So, I don't understand why now the density issues are no longer a concern. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you.

Sam, do you know about that? Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, and I believe it was around 2002, there was a proposed condominium development on this property. It was 48 units. It was all two-bedroom units. The property that was under contract did not include this kind of triangular piece at the northeast, so it was a smaller site for the development. It did not meet our density standards. They required setback variations, they required height variations, and Staff was not supportive of that development for those reasons. My understanding is that after several appearances before the Plan Commission, it was ultimately withdrawn.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sam, can you comment on the 2015 traffic study?

MR. HUBBARD: Sure. So, when the Waverly Inn Memory Care facility was developed in 2015, as part of that development, they did do a traffic and parking analysis in this vicinity, which is why they referenced that previous data that they had.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, you know, along those lines, there was another note that was made, that the high-schoolers were not in high school in April, but they, at least my high school was in school. So, District 214 was open while this. Wait, sorry, looking at Sam, so District 214 was open, correct, at this time?

MR. HUBBARD: I don't know, but when, you know, the study was compared to the 2015 numbers, you know, I believe that the school was in session when those, you know, numbers were taken in 2015 and then adjusted for that growth factor over six years.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, and you know, as people come up, if you want to correct me on that, feel free. We just can't have open dialogue between the Board and the audience.

Okay, that was row was completed, and again nobody over here in the second row wanted to speak so I'm starting over here with the third row. Anyone here in the third row? Anyone on the other side?

Okay, let's just go start over here to the back, the fourth row in the back, just feel free to come on up.

MR. ESCHENBRENNER: Hi, thank you for having us tonight. My name is Robert Eschenbrenner, it's E-s-c-h-e-n-b-r-e-n-n-e-r. I live at 2555 North Ridge which basically runs parallel behind the Stonebridge Apartments off of Chestnut.

Now, I have lived there for 24 years, and in those 24 years the traffic, the main reason again is traffic. There was a wonderful traffic study done, but unfortunately, I don't follow and believe all 56 pages of the traffic study. They went back to 2015, they did one in April of this year, it was a 10 percent decrease, so they increased it to 10 percent. I believe the area has grown in that timeframe, as well as when they looked and then projected it out to 2027, there's a grading of A to F on traffic in intersections both at the morning and in the evening rush hour, and basically what you had somewhat acknowledged is prior to this being added into the neighborhood, a left turn lane off of Chestnut on to Rand is graded an F. You can't get any worse.

They could say it's going to add a minimal, small increase. Any increase you can't get any worse. It's over, they won't even give a time limit, it's greater than a 50-second wait per car to turn left during the evening rush hour for a grade of F per the traffic study. They're saying it's going to back, it backs up, I believe it was 50-some feet, so you're talking at least five cars on average consistent through that hour. So, it's going to take you almost five minutes to make a left-hand turn coming out of that prior to adding the additional cars.

They said in the evening rush hour there's 18 cars coming out of that subdivision. One is headed north, 17 are south. That's 17 more cars going that direction. If you were to turn right, it's graded a C. It's going to go back 90-some feet, that's probably at least nine cars. As they stated, it probably almost goes to the front main drive of Stonebridge. That will add more traffic there.

This is a terrible intersection. I know we're not here to add, we'd have to go somewhere else to add for improvements to this intersection which is what's needed. If IDOT doesn't want to put a right, maybe you need a right-turn lane. You've got two accesses to Rand Road, a straight and a turn right lane. So, if someone wants to go straight, that backs it all up. Whether it's nine cars, whether it's 10 cars, that backs it up. You're going to add more cars there. Turning left is bad. Going across, we know how difficult that is.

I believe there wouldn't be additional traffic by going to a restaurant. You wouldn't have to add a curb cut on Rand Road. There's one that exists from the prior restaurant. Most of the traffic for that restaurant is going to come off of Rand Road. If they come off of Chestnut, which did have one curb cut, that's probably from the neighborhood, so

they'll come in and go back to their homes. Most of the traffic that's going to come down Rand Road going to a restaurant is going to continue coming off of Rand Road.

The schools, currently the buses pick up and pull into Stonebridge at those intersections. Stonebridge is 586 units of apartments in there. There's three entrances, three main entrances: one at the far west end, one in the center of the complex, and the rest, the whole easterly residents of Stonebridge exit on to Chestnut. So, even if you say a third of that 586, that's 180 cars potentially coming out on to Chestnut. Add another 80 from this complex, add the neighborhood that lives directly behind, that's our access to come out to Rand Road to go to Trader Joe's, to go to all these businesses that are right here between Chestnut and Arlington Heights Road.

It's compounding it. I know that it's not totally their fault, but it is adding more traffic. It's not just the existing traffic that's already graded an F, it's adding on top of that. So, it just makes it worse for the neighborhood.

I've been there 24 years. I enjoy living here. This is a great village. I appreciate all you people standing on this board up here and helping to make these decisions. But unless you live in the neighborhood, you don't know the concerns. Yes, something needs to be put there, it is the last piece in that triangle of land, but it is a neighborhood. A lot of kids, a lot of kids playing, a lot of people driving, it's just adding to the issues.

At this point, I guess that's really all my points that I have as my concerns. So, it's the traffic. It's not that it's going to add, we're already really bad. It's horrible and we're just going to compound it. Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

Anybody else in the back on this side of the room? No problem.

MR. MARAK: Hi, my name is Steve Marak, last name is spelled M-a-r-a-k. I live at 2010 North Walnut in Arlington Heights.

I've listened to the traffic. I've listened to the job that these people have done in their surveys and their different studies that they've done. I don't care. Okay, I'm sorry, I don't care. I don't really want public housing in my neighborhood. I've worked here a long time. I've lived here since 1988. I've put up with a lot of stuff since then, and I don't really want it.

It's been proven according to Google and everybody else that's around here that public housing is basically welfare dependent. There's usually single-family parents. There's a lot of high school dropouts. There's drug users. There's non-working people and there's more crime.

I don't want that in my neighborhood. I spent a lot of years working. I'm almost 70 years old, and I really don't want to see my property values go down because you people have decided to put in public housing right across the corner from my area.

That's what I'm, you know, I've listened to all the studies. These guys have started working on this since January. I've been there since 1988. Okay, I've got a little bit more invested than they do. I don't want the public housing in my neighborhood.

That's my only comment. I'm not expecting you to ask me any questions, but I just wanted to say that. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Anybody else from this side of the room?

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

MR. OBERMAN: My name is Richard Oberman, O-b-e-r-m-a-n, 1970 North Walnut Avenue. I live on the other side of Rand Road and traffic is a big concern.

I teach school in Wheeling. I drive through Chestnut, or excuse me, that's Chestnut on the other side, everyday. At 3:45 I'm at the intersection of Rand Road and Chestnut and it's tough to cross. A lot of times I say to myself, am I going the right way? Because it's dangerous. If you add any more cars there, the people I would imagine, I would hope people are getting out and working at rush hour. I would hope if you have 80 cars, you have a combination for 80 cars in this development, I'm hoping people are out working, and they're going at the same time I'm going. Now, that's going to add to the congestion.

So, there was a study and maybe I misunderstood it. My hearing is not too good. I think they said there would be one car per hour or something like that at rush hour. If that's true, I don't believe that at all.

If you cross over from the old, there was an old exit off of, an entrance going into that parking lot. Cross over, you'll see there's a double, you could turn right or left on the other side of Rand Road. Come over, no, let's go a little bit farther south. Right there. If you come down this road about another 200 feet, there's no sidewalks. But everyday there's people walking with carriages, older people walking, there's joggers there, and that road right there, there's a lot of traffic. A lot of people drive too fast there and it's not safe.

Now, if you're going to put more people right there, if people want to get to 53, there's a good chance they're going to come right over down there and they're going to add to that congestion. There's a good chance more people are going to be walking there and it's not safe.

A gentleman mentioned a bus stop. At Stonebridge, the buses do pull in there everyday. I don't know if they're going to be able to pull in here. If they don't, I couldn't imagine.

I can't imagine building a place without an exercise facility and a play area for a large number of people. It's unacceptable.

Property values are not going to go up. Property values are going to go down. I've worked hard. I've got two more years until I retire, and I take pride in my home. I take pride in the neighborhood. I want my property values to go up and I don't want it to go down because somebody's living here that shouldn't be living here. There's other places to live. I would like to, maybe I can go and live in Waikiki, I would love to live there. Maybe they'll give me something there.

A restaurant would be a fantastic idea. It's not going to be crowded at rush hour. It's going to be more in the evenings. It won't add to the rush hour traffic.

I hope that you guys take into consideration, oh, and one last thing. I just texted a good friend that lives about, as soon as you cross through the green space where the high tension wires are, third house on the right, she said they didn't receive anything in the mail. She said no way, and she said the people next to her on either side, they didn't receive anything either. That's it.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, anybody else on this side of the room here?

MS. O'BRIEN: My name is Linda O'Brien. I live in Ivy Hill, and fortunately, I

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

am not in the tenuous position of the folks that have already spoken, those on Waverly or on Chestnut. I am, however, a frequent traveler on Rand Road.

What Mr. Millan's study I think failed to address is that Rand Road is a very important artery, a very well-traveled artery. The intersections of Arlington Heights Road -

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Could you please pull the microphone closer?

MS. O'BRIEN: Okay, and the intersections of Arlington Heights Road and Dundee Road are already rather burdened, especially Dundee Road. Adding 40 to 80 additional cars that will come out of this Crescent and go up and down Rand Road will make it even worse. It will exacerbate an already difficult situation, and I don't even see how they can address the problems we have now. There's really no place to enlarge those roads. So, you can't make a left turn on Dundee without sitting there through three and four lights any time of the day any day of the week.

In addition, I also take issue with the assurance that there will not be particularly a lot of children in this new complex. It's very easy for a single mom to put two sets of bunk beds in the bedroom and have a mom sleeping on an air mattress or a pull-out bed. The Stonebridge Apartments, if I'm not mistaken, are also one and two-bedroom units. Ivy Hill Elementary School where my children attend has probably half the student population coming from the Stonebridge Apartments. I mean, it's a lot of kids and a lot of buses.

So, in the event that this 40-unit does have single moms or young families with children moving in, and why wouldn't they, that will also overburden the traffic routes with buses and the school system. So, that's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you. All right, I believe that's everybody from that side of the room.

Okay, in the back here? Sure.

MR. JOKUM: My name is Ken Jokum, I'm a resident at 2410 North Evergreen, in that group of homes right north of this which is actually part of the neighborhood even though the Petitioner doesn't recognize that.

I want to thank you all for your service on this Commission. It's not easy to do this, and I know it's not the most high paying job in the world. So, thanks.

As you know, Illinois has the highest or the second highest property tax in the nation. It's significantly higher than those lucky people who live in Florida. To give you an idea, our residents pay 10 percent and equalizes the assessed value. Most dates, it's either one to three percent. So, we're pretty darn high.

The point I want to make about that is that these, the property taxes are paid based on 10 percent of the assessed value for residential and 25 percent of the assessed value for commercial. So, your decision to move that from commercial to residential has a huge financial impact on the taxpayers, because when we go from 25 percent being paid by commercial which really helps support our tax burden and we cut that down to 10 percent with this program, who is going to pick up that difference? All of the residents all around are going to do that.

So, this is a financial impact which I think needs to be noted to absolutely everybody. It's not just a matter of commercial, industrial or residential. It's how much more tax burden are we going to put on residents? Today many of our residents struggle to stay in homes that they've already paid for, and very often have paid for those homes at least twice if

you lived in the neighborhood for 20 years. So, due to high taxes, our housing, the people who live there, is becoming unaffordable for seniors or people on fixed income having difficulty staying there and they've already paid for the house, in fact paid for it twice. So, we're putting a greater burden on that group.

I think it's important to note that this Petitioner does not have money from the State of Illinois. He has money from the taxpayers of Illinois. He does not have money granted to him by the Cook County. He has money granted to him by the taxpayers of Cook County. So, our taxpayers who pay tax in Illinois and in Cook County and locally are bearing a major burnt of this effort. I really think we should be considering making this an actual commercial property so we can help support our tax burden.

In the spirit of transparency and fairness and frankly honesty, this proposal should have an economic impact statement which covers the impact to the taxpayer. It's got lots of economic impact but nothing to the taxpayer who is getting an additional burden, and by the way, if we move that from commercial to residential, you're putting an increased burden on the taxpayer. The comparison should also include any proposed impact on increased schools and any proposed impact on increased services that may come as a result of this.

Please, I ask you, do not let something that purports to be affordable housing make the housing of current residents unaffordable. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, anybody else on this side of the room? Oh, I think we've got someone coming up now, and then, sir, if you want to come up after.

MS. GREGO: Hello, my name is Ann Grego, G-r-e-g-o. I live at 2222 North Ridge. So, we are north, I'm sorry, we are south of Rand Road.

I just want to point out about the traffic, it's very, very concerning to me. What people don't necessarily see is due to the 2015 road study, they've made entrances on Rand and Techny for the memory care unit. So, we have cars, right, we have that. Then we have Techny, then we have, I think it's Chestnut, Chestnut. Then there's another little tiny corner there if you come in on Chestnut, and then you can turn into Arlington Performance Center.

So, Techny leading to Rand has an entrance to the Memory Care Center. They also have the cars turning in onto Techny from Rand to get into Memory Care Center from Techny. Then if you turn right or try and go straight, you're competing with the cars that are trying to turn left into the Memory Care Center, Techny, Chestnut, Walnut and, I'm sorry, not Walnut, and the Arlington Performance Center. So, as difficult as it is for anyone to turn right or left coming south, the same thing is going north.

The other thing that we've noticed is that when the traffic is bad, cars will drive through Stonegate to try and beat that intersection and still come and turn left, which means they're creating more traffic coming east. So, I am concerned for my aspect, too. Thanks for listening.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sir, you were going to come up?

MR. HEVERAN: Chairman, Commissioners, when I look up at that property, I see Sofia's, I don't know if any of you guys remember Sofia's, in which I spent my early days in the United States dancing at Sofia's because I live across the street pretty much. My name is Jarlath Heveran.

It's an eyesore for sure. It's been an eyesore for a long time. In fact,

a couple of weeks ago, I had the Arlington Heights Police Department go there because there was gang graffiti on the For Sale sign. That was a good indication that probably it's time to do something with the property.

So, I have to commend the gentleman from Evanston who lives in Florida and drove all the way up to Illinois, to Arlington Heights, to do this great deed for us in a community where the residents are middle upper class and they make on average maybe \$150,000 a year, and he wants to put \$15,000 a year residents among us. I think that's a despicable idea.

I also ask the gentleman, the Petitioner, about the three residents that were on the Zoom residents meeting. If he was any kind of a gentleman at all, he would have seen that that was probably not representative of the people of the neighborhood. I think that maybe he should have done something at that point, maybe took steps to reach out to the neighbors. How about a big sign on the property saying meeting by Zoom on March the 10th, or meeting at the Village Hall on January the 23rd? I think the sign went up a couple of days ago on the property over there. It wasn't there Sunday, so I kind of get upset over things like that. I started thinking things like maybe they're not as upstanding a company as we think they are or as they want us to think they are.

I look at Sam, good old Sam over here with this traffic statistics; I think he got them at the Dollar Store. Really, who lives in this neighborhood can believe that what he said and put up on the PowerPoint could represent the actual traffic on Rand Road?

One of the things that I question is the integrity of the Petitioner and his company. I question what measures does the Board take to conduct inquiries as to that very question. Do we know this Petitioner? He says he wants to spread his wings or come in to Illinois to commence further development. I'd like to know what sort of projects he has been involved in the past. We need to know that because our livelihoods depend on his success in gaining your approval.

I'm not sure, I just found out about this a couple of days ago. I would personally like to do some research myself and before, I'd hate to see something else come up or something to start digging over there before we had an opportunity as residents to take a closer look at this ourselves. It's our children that live over there and play over there in the streets. We have little crime, once in a while we get something major, but for the most part we don't have burglaries over there. Projects like this will bring burglaries to our neighborhood. They'll bring drug us and they'll bring crime. That's my business, crime.

I see these affordable housing residents all the time. I deal with them all the time. Whatever they tell you about one-person or two-person occupancies, that's not true. That's not true. That's for the statistics book. That doesn't, it doesn't work like that, and you probably know that already from Arlington Heights, from dealing with it. Go a mile up Rand Road, see how that is. There's shootings up there every night because the gangs are all over the place in Palatine.

We don't want that in our town. You don't want that in our town, let me tell you. So, I think the only thing that I would ask is that you put the brakes on this for now until we, the residents, who have invested everything in our community that we love, we dearly love our community, we ask you not to jump the gun on this one. Give us time as residents to figure out, number one, who he is, and as well as what the pros and cons for us.

I'm certainly not averse to progress in any neighborhood. I think it's

great that entities are willing to put money into certain areas, but this is not the area. So, I ask you, please, put the brakes on this project for right now until we have a closer look at it. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, anybody else from this side? Yes?

MS. SYLVESTER: Good evening. Hi, Sam. Sam? I'm Alice. I'm Alice Sylvester. I live at 2509 North Walnut Avenue.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Can you spell your last name?

MS. SYLVESTER: S-y-l-v-e-s-t-e-r. I feel like I'm playing clean up so I've got about five or six points that I want to drive home in the conversation today. First of all, I want to go on record in saying I'm an advocate for affordable housing. The housing situation in America is despicable and I'm all in favor to just this issue. It's a human issue, so I'm in favor of the concept.

I am not in favor of the traffic the concept has wrought and the traffic situation that we are living in right now. We are living in a situation, as you know, where it is impossible to cross Rand Road and it is impossible to turn left into the retail area of Arlington Heights Road pretty much any time during the day, and that's by car. One of the reasons why is that Arlington Heights Road is posted at, what, 45 miles an hour, which means the average car is doing somewhere between 50 and 60. I know it because I was t-boned crossing Rand Road several years back.

Now, try and be a bicycle crossing Rand Road to get over to Frontier Park. No bikes can reasonably, safely cross at Chestnut. No pedestrians can cross. So, we are cut off to the south side from the light at Kennicott, which as you can see is significantly far to the west, okay. So, there is no access to Greenbrier through Berkley Square.

I also want to point out, and Sam and I had a dialogue about this by e-mail today, there are two traffic signals associated with the shopping mall on the north end of Rand Road, okay, two traffic lights. There are 14 businesses in there right now, two traffic lights for Harvest Fresh and the barber, okay. It's luxurious, it's a complete waste of time if you get stopped at both of those, it's insane and infuriating. I recommend that the Village engage in a very meaningful conversation with IDOT about removing one of those traffic lights and putting it at the corner of Chestnut and Rand and make that cross safe. We are in a situation where it's rated F already, and it will be F minus with this development.

The other issue that has not really been raised tonight that I take very seriously and I just think we absolutely need to consider is the impact on the Park District and the Rand-Berkley play lot. As you may know, because of the church that went into that corner, we now have children from the church using that play lot. We have Futabakai families using that play lot. We have kids whose families are playing soccer or baseball in the fields at that play lot, and there is no equipment left for the original neighborhood and the houses in that neighborhood.

If you do a little bit of a math exercise here, so we have 40 units, let's say half of them have kids, right? Let's say they have 1.9 kids per unit. That's 40 more children who will have the only access to a park in Arlington Heights is the Rand and Berkley play lot that is already at maximum capacity. It's unacceptable.

I believe the first public sign of a meeting was associated with the Design Commission meeting. There was no sign posted for a neighborhood meeting for the

March meeting, so i want to reiterate that. Maybe they don't have to, but that's why this is the first time we're hearing any of this.

I think in order to protect our property values, we may need to add signage up beyond the ComEd station and say welcome to Berkley Square and everything behind this is not Barkley Square, these is where our property values are and these are the property values that we have to uphold. If we need to draw a designation there, then I think the Village should seriously consider doing that, because this whole report is very myopic. The neighborhood that they consider here is Stonebridge and the stores, not Greenbrier and not Berkley Square to the north. That's a mistake.

So, thank you very much. Thanks for listening.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Anybody else on this side of the room?

Anybody else on this side of the room? All right, I believe --

MR. HUBBARD: I have two items that I would like to read that I received via e-mail and asked to share at the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Oh, thank you.

MR. HUBBARD: May I read them in?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Of course.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you. This is an e-mail from Kyle Grove:

Hello Sam, I'm e-mailing you to say I am against the reclassification and rezoning of the commercial area on Rand Road to a moderate density multi-family zone. Here are some concerns. I'm not in favor of additional rental property that does not contribute real estate taxes to Cook County or Arlington Heights. Taxes are already too high.

What background checks are being performed on tenants if any to ensure our community stays safe? There is already a property of this type in Downtown Arlington Heights. Des Plaines and Mount Prospect had similar proposals that were voted down. I'm sure those residents had similar concerns. I wish the residents could have a vote on this because I'm sure most would be against it.

I would appreciate it if you would share these concerns at the meeting and thank you for your time. Kyle Grove, 1519 North Kaspar Avenue.

Mr. Hubbard, I'm asking you why you have chosen this location. Stonebridge Apartments is directly across Chestnut. According to yardimatrix.com there are 586 apartment units in Stonebridge. There is no need for more apartment units. The traffic on Chestnut Avenue has already seen an increase due to the new Holy Nation Presbyterian Church that has opened. Is there a possibility of overcrowding at Ivy Hill Elementary with the addition of these 40 new families? We will need to pay more real estate taxes to support this.

What about the potential safety implications for the neighborhood? What about the decrease to our property values this will cause? For some neighbors, it is our biggest investment. I ask you, would you welcome this property as a neighbor to your home? I understand diversity and welcome it. This neighborhood is full of it. Look at the public school, look at the new church down the road, and the private school just around the block.

This property would be better suited to our community as an addition to our parks and recreations. I feel there are other areas in Arlington Heights that can welcome diversity into their neighborhoods. Thank you. Nikki Wolverton.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: That's it? All right, with that, seeing no further comments from the public, the public comment portion of the meeting is now closed. Just a reminder, now that it's closed, we cannot address any further comments from the public. That includes if someone comes up and makes a statement grumbling or comments from the public, that's a lie or that's wrong, you know, any of those kind of comments, we will not be able to address those and I will ask those to stop.

Keeping in mind we are a recommending body, I don't know how this is going to go because we haven't talked about it, but this isn't the end. So, listen, take notes, you are going to have other opportunities to voice your opinion about this project.

Okay, so with that, I would assume we have a number of follow-up comments, questions, I would assume the Petitioner probably, might as well come on up because there's going to be some comments.

Would you like to start?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure. Maybe we could have Mr. Green or Mr. Hubbard tell us a little bit about, is this public housing? Give us the definition of public housing.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Are you referring to Section 8?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: No, I'm just, we heard the public speak to public housing generically, and I'd like to have the Petitioner tell me what kind of property we have here.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Zunamon will probably give you a clearer answer or a longer one.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Please speak up.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right, I'm having trouble hearing you, too.

MR. GREEN: Sorry. It is not public housing, it is affordable housing. It is under the auspices of Illinois Housing Development Authority and the programs they create to provide more affordable housing throughout. The cost, if I can use a cost number, the cost related to per unit probably exceeds the cost of most houses. In the estimate, with \$18 million, you're talking of somewhere in the range of \$180,000 to \$190,000 in cost per unit. So, this is not in any way, shape or form resembling that. In conjunction with that, I'll say that as part of that program, it also requires us to provide a lot of amenities. Somebody mentioned exercise before, there is an exercise room in this. We do have amenities inside and outside. So, that's the semi-long answer.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll let others ask questions and then I may come back.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, Commissioner Lorenzini?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes. Mr. Zunamon, please?

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes?

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, when you interview potential residents, what type of profile do you look for? Are there any limits or requirements that a person must meet other than the income?

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes, so I want just to make a couple of things clear with regard first to the public housing question that you asked. So, public housing is really, you know,

owned and developed by housing authorities, public agencies. Again, we are a private development company. So, we work with all the big, you know, banks and other private folks that you work with. But it's a public-private partnership, and that's why this program that was developed in the 80's has been so successful and is a nationwide program. It's federal income housing tax credits that get allocated to each state, and private and nonprofit developers like to apply for them.

So, at the end of the day, to answer your question further when we're doing this, you know, we are the long-term owner. We are a private company and we have lots of big guarantees and other dollars at stake with banks and other folks that we work with. Again, it's not in our best interest either to create, you know, this kind of slum village that we're envisioning here.

A big part of what Mr. Green mentioned earlier is that a lot of thought was taken with regards to the unit mix and the sizes and being more one-bedrooms and twos. We don't have any three-bedrooms here. I know there was a comment with regards to, you know, potentially someone could move in and put a bunk bed and there could be all these people living in the house. That's just not possible. When you build a one-bedroom, two people could live there max. When you build a two-bedroom, four people. It's two per bedroom.

We have so many compliance and regulation with not just the state but the county and our lenders, our syndicators, our self. I mean, again we don't want any problems. If we basically create a community that then we own and either personally manage, which would be the goal over time, or third party manage, then we don't make any money as a company. It just doesn't make a lot of sense.

So, I know there's been a lot of focus on, hey, these eight units potentially, you know, they could be \$15,000 rental income. Well, you have to make under \$20,000, you have to make over \$15,000, but that's eight units. The rest of them, we're talking about a one-bedroom, somebody is going to have to make under \$40,000. I may, you know, I've got some gray hairs and a couple of kids now, but when I started in this profession, I made \$40,000. So, if everybody in this room would be upset that I would live in a community and be your neighbor and then come in front of you at a later date and build housing to serve the community, I just find that tough.

I'm speaking very personally about it because I work with a lot of people in my office that are accountants, construction folks, property management people that live in the buildings that we have built as a company and I'd be happy to call them my neighbors because I'm happy to call them my colleagues and my friends. So, if we're here for a hunt about, you know, a family of four that makes under \$55,000 is not someone you want in your neighborhood because they're going to cause drugs and crime, and we as a long-time owner and have lots of financial burden at stake want that to be in your neighborhood, I'm just here to tell you I find it a really hard time to, I don't know, to not just make the logical argument that I'm making here that after eight months and the next year and a half to two years that will take us to actually build this development, that we would just, you know, be okay to just make it like that and we have no investment in it.

So, I apologize for the long, you know, winded, impassioned answer but that's, I mean, that's the reality of it.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Our education has been, with regard to affordable housing, it's basically people that are wage earners that typically live in the community

addressing, let's say public service workers, teachers, but people that actually can live in a community that they serve. I think that was, you know, basically one of the missions and sort of the premise for the affordable housing. To some extent, you know, let's throw another one in there and that's subsidized housing, and we have that all over our Village where we try to create that balance. If that, and that's, if I'm wrong, somebody tell me, you know, that that is the wrong concept.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, going back to if you were to pick tenants, say you had a unit available and you had three people applying for it, what requirements do you use or things that you can do legally to pick the, let's say the best person for the neighborhood?

MR. ZUNAMON: So, realistically --

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Do you have preference for people with ADA handicaps or some type of learning disability or is there a preference for anything like that? Not that there's anything wrong with that.

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes, no. Ultimately, at the end of the day, some of the units as explained by Mr. Green are handicap accessible but not all of them, only, you know, a handful. But realistically on a global basis, you as a company and a property management company, you make a decision and you say, hey, here's our minimum criteria across the board. Everybody needs a credit score of whatever, 650. You can't have anything on your, you know, when we do a personal background check with regards to crimes or violent crimes or anything like that, drugs. You can't have any evictions. You need to make X amount of dollars. Sometimes that's two times the rent, sometimes it's 2.5, sometimes it's three times the rent if there's a big demand.

I think one of the things in your package is a market study that we'd done that's some 50-odd pages that says, hey, this primary market area, there's roughly 3,000 rent burdened households. We may not all know them because we don't see them, and there's only a handful of folks I see in my life with my kids and wife these days, but that's why I hire professionals like a market analyst and a traffic engineer because I can't figure those things out by myself.

So, to answer your question, you set a baseline, and then if all those people meet it, it's really on a first come first serve. But a lot of times, you set the criteria high enough that, you know, you really are getting the cream of the crop of these cost burdened individuals and families.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: And the units are being set aside for 60 percent of AMI or even 30 percent. But so, what is your business model? Arlington Heights requires 10 percent affordable housing units. Why did you go with 100 percent? What is the benefit there?

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes, without getting into all the financial mechanisms, in effect when you apply for housing tax credits, they are only generated by you building units that will serve low income families, individual seniors. So, if we only build 10 percent of them like, you know, the ordinance or other ordinances that we're seeing around the country, then you would only generate that amount of money for those units.

The business model not just for us, but any developer is to build basically all the units affordable, they generate these credits, and then you are able to effectively sell them to large banks who give you equity up front to build these developments. In return,

they get an offset on their taxes for the next 10 years. Then you agree that you will manage in, not perpetuity but, you know, 30 years, in Florida, it's 50 years. So, you take on that risk that, you know, you're able to get some equity up front to build these developments, and then you're the long-term owners of them.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: I can see some of the tenants' concerns about 100 percent affordable housing. So, not that that's wrong or bad, but how do you make sure that you get the right, I guess it goes back to the question, how do you ensure you don't have six people living in a one-bedroom apartment?

MR. ZUNAMON: Well, I mean, there's monthly checks. There's compliance reporting. At the end of the day, I think it would be very difficult for you to apply somewhere and represent that, hey, we know the max is four and somehow you've got eight. I mean, we have a property manager on site and other folks, and again if, you know, you guys have lived in rental communities, typically people talk and it's not that difficult to figure out, hey, this unit is not good and this unit is not following the rules and this is what's happening. I mean, we take care of it and that's something very, you know, near and dear to us. Just like you do in your own community where you start to make, you know, friends' groups, I mean, that's your proximity to people. If there's a problem, you go to the manager, the manager resolves that.

So, I think it's something that would be tough to get away with long term that, you know, to have an eight-member family when there could only be four or two max.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: So, say a tenant, what would your typical profile be? How would you explain the typical tenant at the 30 percent AMI level in a one-bedroom apartment? Single? Married? Kids?

MR. ZUNAMON: Sure. Well, it really depends. I mean, it's such a small segment of, you know, the groups that we work with because it's usually only the, you know, 10 or 20 percent of the building. But I think, you know, the other thing that kind of we've touched on a little bit is, you know, this is a family development, but that really just means that anybody could live there. So, realistically, we could build this 40-unit development and the whole building could be made up of, you know, what is considered in affordable housing as seniors which is 55 and older. So, you could have an entire community of seniors that are 55 and older and that would still qualify us as a family development.

So, the folks that fall into that category, I mean, it's hard to give you just the typical range because we build throughout the state and we have, you know, lots of these developments that we own and operate. But I mean, yes, it ranges the gamut like any other income threshold. So, we just built a development close to Jacksonville that half of the units were developed for people that make 30 percent or less, and half of them were for 80 percent or less. That's a development I oversaw and we leased it out in, I don't know, two months, and it's basically fully occupied.

So, it just, I mean, there's so many people out there that need this kind of housing and, again, yes, we take a lot of pride in it. It just, it doesn't make sense for us from a business perspective to bring people in our community that aren't going to be able to pay rent, create issues, and then we're constantly having to, you know, upkeep, re-change units, paint them, all that kind of stuff.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: One question for Sam. Sam, it sounds like obviously there's a traffic problem now through the neighborhood and this isn't going to make it any better. But is there anything the Village can do to try help things out like speed control or

speed bumps or some type of traffic control devices?

MR. HUBBARD: Again, we're somewhat limited relative to the Chestnut and Rand intersection. But certainly, you know, up north and east on Chestnut, you know, the Village can look at if additional traffic signal, I'm sorry, stop signs are needed on those intersections up there. I don't know if the community is supportive of, you know, speed control bumps on streets but, you know, these are other, there are certainly traffic calling measures that the Village can look into that may be practical to help reduce, you know, cut-through traffic and speeding on Chestnut.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: All right, thank you. That's all.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Green?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, I would like to just make a statement. In the past, in the recent past, I asked our since retired Village attorney what we could do to limit the number of people that live in a house or rent an apartment. In other words, how much control do we actually have? Her response was, basically, we don't. If a person buys a house, they can have as many people live there as they would like. That was her answer to me when I asked that question. So, when you tell me that you can somehow restrict the number of people that rent an apartment, I don't believe you can do that legally, and only from my past experience with our Village attorney.

So, and I just have to, I would like to make a statement because I'm torn between the residents that are living in this area, and I'm going to read Section 1-6.01, a statement of policy. This is from our Municipal Code. It says:

It is the policy of the Village of Arlington Heights that its elected and appointed officials should in all cases exercise their judgment and perform their duties for the sole benefit of the citizens of the Village of Arlington Heights.

That is our mission as Plan Commissioners. That is what's giving me turmoil on tonight's case here, and that's all I want to say. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Before we move on, I recall what you're speaking about because it was an issue that came before the Board. That was related to a house, not related to an apartment or a condominium building that can have association rules.

COMMISSIONER DROST: And leases.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right. So, in a house, a house, we cannot restrict a house, and they're our houses in Arlington Heights that we can't stop the number of people that live there, but condominiums and apartment complexes do have rules that they can implement. So, while the Village can't enforce it, they can.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Okay, so if somebody is renting a house, can they enforce it?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: The landlord could.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: But not the Village.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: No. George?

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, two questions. One is I've got the same concern about the traffic and having an F is very bad, and that has to sort of work itself out. If there's some solutions, those aren't ones that we're going to really address here, but that would be the red flag for me on the traffic. That's not a happy situation.

Second, some of the economics, and maybe Mr. Green or Mr. Zunamon, what kind of real estate tax is being generated right now on that vacant commercial

property? And when it's developed, what's the expected real estate tax revenue that's going to be generated from that development when it's fully online?

MR. ZUNAMON: I don't want to misquote, you know, the number right now. But I was just speaking with the broker and seller the other day, I know that it's less than \$10,000. I think it's roughly \$8,000, maybe a little less even, but what we've underwritten is about \$65,000. So, when we build this, we plan to pay roughly \$65,000 in taxes. So, I understood some of the calculations and what's been up here, but I can tell you as a person who runs the pro forma and puts together, hey, does this or does this not make sense, you know, \$65,000 in there is the number we expect to pay.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, so, and that \$65,000, is that really a full value payment? If you had some commercial enterprises, let's say the restaurant, you throw in a couple of commercial buildings, those commercial buildings would generate more real estate tax than a 40-unit affordable housing unit. I mean, we have an expert on our board here who can pipe in as well, but it seems to me that, one, you're taking the step to really help the taxpayers by developing that property. It's not the most desirable in the world.

Secondly though, actually real estate taxes that are generated might not achieve the same level if it was put to a different use. I mean, you don't have to answer that, but --

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes. No, I just, I wanted to make it clear that, you know, just because we're building an affordable housing doesn't mean we don't expect to pay taxes. So, it's definitely going to take it much higher than it is right now and, again, I mean, that's the estimate that we've underwritten. I mean, hey, you know, hopefully it will be a little less, but if it's not, then hey, that's what we're in for.

COMMISSIONER DROST: That's it. Those are just two comments, you know, at least as you process this.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Commissioner Ennes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes. I have a couple of questions, too. I'm concerned about two issues. I'm concerned about the traffic.

I live in the area, not too many blocks off of this and I am one of the people that uses that as a cut-through to get to Rand Road and head north. But for the most part, it's to avoid Arlington, Palatine, and Rand. I mean, that's a terrible corner, and that's what a lot of people are using this cut-through to avoid. I can understand the neighbors' desire to not have this get any worse.

I would really, John, you're the architect? John, you eliminated in drawing your proposed plan, you eliminated the driveway out to Rand Road.

MR. GREEN: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Why did you do that?

MR. GREEN: Confluence. It creates too many confluence turns very close together. IDOT would not look favorably on that. They would ask us to remove it anyway. In addition to that, somebody mentioned right-in/right-out. That, on a road like this, can create more problems because of the number of people who try to cheat on them, and just trying to cheat makes that even more dangerous than having it there. So, the goal is to eliminate that. One of the young ladies who came up spoke about the number of curb cuts up and down the road and how they have contributed to that issue of confluence. So, this eliminates that.

Also, if I may, going on to the traffic element of it, there has been a

lot of discussion tonight about 80 cars, 80 cars, 80 cars. There's 80 parking spaces; there's not necessarily 80 cars. There's 40 units. In conjunction with that, one of the things we considered when we were talking about variations was that the traffic report indicates that we could probably cut the number of parking spaces by 25 to 30 percent of what we're building because they're not really necessary for our use and our demographic of one and two-bedroom units. We elected not to pursue a variation and to build the 80 spaces. So, we're building 80 spaces, but I think we should look at the cars and we do stand behind our traffic study which studies the vehicles, not the number of parking spaces.

So, when you sit there and go, oh, 80 spaces, how can there be that little? That's because that's 80 spaces, we're talking about the traffic impact that this development adds to it.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Right, but unfortunately, it sounds like a lot of your notices never got to people and they were never able to attend your neighbor meeting. One condition I would have on my vote would be that you reschedule that before going on to the Village Board. Now, I don't know how the other Commissioners feel about that, but that's an important thing, for the developers to hear from the neighbors a lot of things they would tell you, and you can answer. You're not in a formal setting like this, you can answer their questions and let them know how you worked that out.

One of my concerns is how you manage the property. While it seemed like you weren't sure what document I was talking about before, it's referenced in the documentation we got from Staff, and it's also referenced in the Housing Commission, your meeting before the Housing Commission. It's the tenant preference guidelines. I would like to see that be a part of the presentation that goes to the Village Board so that the Trustees can look at that, because I think that's important. You're hearing it from some of the Commissioners. You're hearing it from some of the neighbors. It's like what are the criteria for selecting tenants?

From my years on this Commission, I understand the difference between public housing and affordable housing. It takes a while to understand that. When I came up with that \$15,000 a year figure, that was looking at the lowest that somebody could be in there, and yes, granted, the other apartments are going for well over \$800 or whatever and that will take a much higher income.

One other question that I have is you have a lot of these buildings around the country. Can you tell me about how many? There's quite a few on your website.

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes. I think that we are up to roughly I think 30 properties that we manage and some 35 --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That you manage.

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And how many have you developed over the years? Is that about what you've developed?

MR. ZUNAMON: No, we've developed more, but the company has been around for, I don't know, maybe 30 years.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, so you're selling off some of them from time-to-time?

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes, but you know, they've done, you know, market rate housing, and since I've been there for, I guess a little over six years, I mean I personally have put together about 700 units and obviously I have a lot of colleagues and other folks in the

organization that have built a ton as well.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: What is your, what I like about affordable housing is you've got a lot of starting professionals like you said. You started, we all when we started our careers, we're not making a lot of money and it's good to have a unit like that that you can go into that isn't a slum. What kind of turnover do you have? Are these units working? Are people coming in there making \$40,000 a year and they, you know, advance in their career? Or are they stagnant and they get in there and they stay in there? So, what kind of turnover figures do you have with your residents?

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes. That's an interesting question, so I may have to, obviously, you know, think about how to answer this, but I think, you know, realistically there's two sides of the coin, right? There's a lot of people that move into an apartment and there could be an argument made to say, hey, people should live there a long time because we want them invested in the community and feeling good about where they live and really, you know, what they do.

I would tell you that what I endeavor in all the communities we build is to build them to the highest of standards. I mean, just wrapped up a job in Fort Lauderdale that has porcelain tile flooring, granite countertops and is nicer than where I live. So, at the end of the day, you know, I'm not sure why people would want to leave there.

That being said, in terms of the turnover you're talking about, I would say that it could range anywhere from, you know, five percent at the low end to 20 percent at the high end.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: On annual basis?

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes, but we're not really encouraged to turnover a unit if that makes sense. I mean, it doesn't, if people are in their units, they're enjoying, this is an opportunity for them to have additional disposable income to utilize to, you know, do something else and, you know, maybe get another, you know, career or education or what have you and this is temporary housing for them. It doesn't make sense for us to say, hey, we'd like you out of here. So, no, you're paying rent, you're a great part of our community, we want you here.

So, I think it's a double-edged sword because maybe I think what I'm hearing is like it would be great if, you know, these units turned over all the time because then everybody is leaving. But I mean, I don't know how realistic that is either and if that's really a situation you'd want where you have a community where there's 40 new families every year. I don't know if you build much of a community that way.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: No, I'm just thinking if these are affordable housing for the purpose of being affordable housing where people are starting careers, that you would hope that they would move up and be able to move on into better houses, but that's a whole another issue. I think you might want to have that turnover figure for your presentation to the Village Board.

MR. GREEN: If I may add one thing to an earlier question you asked?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'm sorry?

MR. GREEN: Turnstone Development is also a partner in this and they have approximately two dozen facilities in the Illinois area.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: And they might be able to provide that kind of a number?

MR. GREEN: They have, they can provide some of that information, but

LeGRAND REPORTING & VIDEO SERVICES

Chicago & Roselle, Illinois - Miami & Orlando, Florida

(630) 894-9389 - (800) 219-1212

they also have been around for 30 years and they, well, they work in Florida also.

MR. ZUNAMON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay, that's all I have.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: John?

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: I'm really kind of torn on this because I am in favor of affordable housing. But I question, you know, your 100 percent number. I've seen developers come into our Village and we have a 15 percent requirement. Again, I don't know the finances behind all of this, but they turn that down and pay a fee in lieu of because it doesn't make it financially feasible for them. How this makes it feasible for you to have 100 percent, again, I don't know the finances but I'm concerned by that.

I think it was about 15 years ago we had a developer that built a couple of condominium units up on Boeger Road, and that was 15 percent affordable housing. One of the first requisites for applicants would be people from Arlington Heights, residents of Arlington Heights would have first opportunity to buy these affordable housing units. I'm familiar with it because my daughter had just graduated from college, she started a career as a teacher and she qualified for it, and she purchased one of them. But I recall that they weren't all purchased, they had a number of affordable units that weren't used.

So, you know, with the AMI and I don't know what it is here in Arlington Heights, but if you're going with 100 percent, does that mean you're going to be going outside Arlington Heights, bringing people in from other less favorable communities into our Village? I'm concerned by that. So, I'm really kind of torn by that.

I understand, you know, so many comments here about the traffic and so forth. Yes, this will add to it. I don't understand why you have 80 parking spaces if you have only 40 units. I'd be in favor of less parking spaces and having more greenery, green space there which would make it more attractive.

But again, my main concern is if, this 30 percent of AMI and that means you're going outside of the Village of Arlington Heights, bringing other people in that may be less desirable, that's causing me to think more negatively towards this project. That's my comments.

MR. GREEN: I will tell you relative to the turnovers and those relations, we've been doing this here in Illinois, so going back to 1995, and the projects that we've worked on with Turnstone and DKI and several of the others that do this specific type of development, to this day they still have waiting lists to get into the buildings.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, I have a couple of comments to make. I haven't been able to say a lot about this project yet.

First of all, regarding the traffic, I sympathize with the residents. I'd like to remind the residents that we're all residents of Arlington Heights. I happen to live in an area that has constant cross traffic. We've complained, we've worked with the Village, I mean, I get it. I get it. But we've got a vacant parcel here that has allowed uses, and the traffic engineer which is KLOA which is a highly respected traffic engineer that we've come across this board on a number of occasions, says that many of the allowed uses would bring more traffic to the area.

So, as a Plan Commissioner, I have to think about the impact not from just this project but what would be a permitted use and how this project would vary from that. I'm being told from the engineer that it would be less restrictive. I am not a traffic engineer. I have to rely on the traffic engineers that know what they are doing. I don't go into other

people's businesses and tell them that they're wrong because I know better, and I hope people don't do that to my business. These people know what they're doing and I have to trust them.

So, I do sympathize with the traffic issue because I have dealt with it in my own neighborhood. It took years and years and years of working with the Village to come up with solutions, but we did come up with a solution. We worked with the Village and they did work with us. It takes time. You have to be patient. It's not entirely within their control, but the Village actually does care about whether or not your children are safe on the streets. They just have restrictions and they have processes they have to follow, so work with the Village to that. I think regardless of whether or not this project goes forward, and from what I'm hearing is the traffic is there regardless of whether or not this project is there, and a project is going to be going into this space whether it's this one or another one. So, I would suggest working with the Village now on the traffic issue.

On the Park District and the park being overcrowded, the park isn't just for you. I'm sorry but it's not. It's a public park. It's for everyone. If I want to bring my kids from my neighborhood to your park, sorry, but I get to do that. This building is coming in, if your park is overcrowded, guess what, the Park District is getting over \$100,000. Go talk to the Park District, ask them to earmark it for your park. Ask them if they'll do that, go fight with the Park District, maybe they'll make expansions, maybe they'll do something there, but it's a public park.

I do not go around the public park where my kids play and ask where everybody lives, okay, and my park is crowded as well. So, you know, we're all one community, people, we're all one community. People get to, I get to go visit friends and go to the park.

I know that I'm very worked up, but I am extremely worked up over hearing my fellow Commissioners, hearing people in my community talk about less desirables coming to our community. I cannot be more disappointed in hearing that.

The people that are in these affordable housing units, by the way, I can walk from my house to an affordable housing unit, at least one if not two. I can walk to Section 8 housing. My kids go to school with kids that are in affordable housing units. The crime is not more, and I moved there knowing that that building was there. The crime is not worse where I live.

These people are not undeserving of living in our community because they make less than we do. They are frequently teachers. They are young firefighters. They are students. They are seniors. I have friends whose parents live in units that are affordable housing, seniors that are single that have lost their spouse and they cannot afford anywhere else to live but in these units.

So, by assuming that somehow there's some crime faction that's going to move in just because we have affordable housing, first of all, is discriminatory, completely discriminatory. Some of the questioning on behalf of this board is troubling to me because we have to be very careful, Commissioners, of discriminatory housing practices, and that our ruling could be viewed as discriminatory if we're not careful about some of the questioning and some of the statements that we make.

So, yes, I'm very worked up over this because this 'not in my backyard,' it is in my backyard. I have traffic issues. I have affordable housing in my backyard. I have friends who live in affordable housing, their parents who live in affordable housing. These are not some sort of criminal element, and to believe that somebody who makes less than \$40,000 is somehow automatically a criminal/drug addict/going to ruin our community is

extremely disappointing to me, that this is the opinion. So, clearly I'm very worked up, and I am. I'm very disappointed in much of what I've heard today.

So, quite clearly, I am in favor of this project. I think the 100 percent component is fabulous because I've frequently concerned myself over buildings that have 10 percent component and worried if the residents are going to walk by and go, ooh, that's that affordable housing unit, and that those people won't feel fully incorporated or fully integrated into their community. So, I think the 100 percent is terrific.

I think that the location, while, yes, I am very concerned about the traffic, there's a lot of things that could go in there that could be worse. So, this is a great building. The pictures that we've seen of your other buildings are beautiful. Clearly you care about the maintenance of the building. We have a lot more restrictions in the number of people living in these apartments, as I've pointed out, than we would if this was single-family homes, and the number of cars could be significantly more.

I'm surprised that we want less parking because every other project that comes before this, I'm the one arguing for less parking and everyone else is arguing that we need more parking. So, I think if we're getting 80 parking spots, we should have 80 parking spots. So, that's generally my soapbox for today.

MR. HUBBARD: Sue?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes?

MR. HUBBARD: We are approaching 10:30.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: That's what I was, yes, so I need a motion to extend.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll make that motion to extend this meeting by half an hour.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll second.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, with my soapbox --

MR. HUBBARD: All in favor?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I'm sorry, all in favor?

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: With my soapbox firmly removed, any other discussion?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I have some comments, too. First of all, I couldn't agree more with you. I agree with all the points that you made and I have been disturbed by some of the discussion here tonight as well. We can't expect these developers to solve all of our problems. If we have a traffic problem or we had a problem with the parks or other things, we can't expect, this Commission can't say that we can't put this in because we're expecting this developer to take care of all the problems when many of those problems probably existed when we moved there. So, I --

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Jensen?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Lynn, could you move your microphone? They're having trouble hearing.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'm sorry.

Anyway, my point here is that you can't expect these developers who come before us, and we have a limited set of things we can evaluate them on. The Board has a broader set of things, and you will have time to do your research and go to the Board, and the

Board can make decisions that are not as constrained as the ones that we would make. But we can't expect these people to fix all of our problems with traffic, parks, and other things that have been upsetting us for years. So, it's unfair to actually use that as a standard by which we will evaluate whether we're going to vote for or against this property.

I would agree with Chairwoman Dawson that you need to go to the Village and talk to them about your parks, if that's a problem, or your traffic, and try to work through those issues because they are not the issues of these people. Their contribution is much smaller than that.

We had a comment that we're lowering the tax rate that we would get. Well, 25 percent of having a vacant property for 20 years doesn't produce any revenue. Having something there taxed at 10 percent does have some revenue for the Village. So, I think it's kind of wishful thinking that we have not been able to put anything commercial in this area for 20 years and all of a sudden we're going to do that and generate a lot of additional tax revenue to the Village.

So, I think, once again I would just conclude with the point that Sue has made a number of times. We are a recommending body. You have much more latitude when you go before the Board, and it will be sometime before this item goes before the Board. Do your research in a dispassionate way, bring your case forward, make your points, and maybe you can convince the Board. But there's a limit to the kinds of things that we have to take into consideration in evaluating this kind of a project.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Any other comments from the Board?
Discussion? Motion? Lots of silence.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sue, I'll make a motion.

A motion to recommend to the Village Board of Trustees approval of PC #21-010, Crescent Place, an Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to reclassify the subject property from 'commercial' to 'moderate density multi-family'; Rezoning of the subject property from the B-2 General Business District to the R-6 Multiple-Family Dwelling District; and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval to consolidate the subject property into one lot.

This recommendation is subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Final Plat of Subdivision approval shall be required.**
- 2. Impact fees in accordance with Chapter 29 of the Municipal Code shall be required for each unit within the development.**
- 3. The Applicant is responsible to ensure that the subject property is and remains in full compliance with the requirements of Article XVII of Chapter 7 of the Village Code, being the Village's Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance, and the Village's Inclusionary Housing Guidelines, including, without limitation, the following:**
 - A. Providing in perpetuity, at a minimum, two actual on-site affordable one-bedroom units and two actual on-site affordable two-bedroom units within the development, which units shall be in compliance with Section 7-1707(B)(3) of the Village Code;**
 - B. Ensuring compliance with all other provisions of the Inclusionary Zoning**

Ordinance and Inclusionary Housing Guidelines as applicable;

- C. The developer shall submit a request for residency and local working preferences to HUD and IHDA in order to seek approval to incorporate Arlington Heights' Inclusionary Housing Ordinance tenant preferences in the tenant selection plan for this development consistent with their regulations; and**
- D. Even if not required, for any units the developer is making available as affordable, that the developer will make reasonable efforts to make those affordable units available according to the tenant preference in the Inclusionary Housing Guidelines.**
- 4. Compliance with the May 11, 2021 Design Commission motion shall be required.**
- 5. At time of Final Plat of Subdivision, the Petitioner shall provide additional details on the light fixtures as well as a revised photometric plan that conforms to all code requirements for review and approval by Staff.**
- 6. Prior to appearing before the Village Board, the Petitioner shall hold another community meeting with advertisement and invitations to all property owners within 750 feet of the subject property.**
- 7. The Petitioner shall comply with all federal, state, and Village codes, regulations, and policies.**

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Do we have a second?

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, roll call.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Wait, I have a question.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: You have a question? Sorry, I should have asked if there was any discussion.

Yes?

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I had mentioned that I thought the Petitioner should have a new neighbor meeting prior to going to the -- pardon?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Do you want to add that as a requirement or do you want --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I would like that to be a requirement that they hold that. Obviously --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, we should discuss an amendment to the motion.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I'll accept that amendment.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll accept that.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, we would be adding a seventh condition. Do you have any objection to adding a requirement that there be another community meeting?

MR. GREEN: No, we've had one; we're glad to have two.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sure. I think that what the members of the audience were asking though is that you go beyond the 500.

MR. GREEN: I'm going to have a little trouble figuring that out because --

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: I understand, it is challenging.

MR. GREEN: I'm guessing that we have people here, in fact I know that we have people here who are over 1,000 feet.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right, I understand. It is always challenging to decide because when you cut it off at 1,000, then there's someone who's 1,100 who says why couldn't I have gotten a notice. We've heard that many, many, many times. I think that definitely the people that are in attendance today could somehow, I don't know how we would gather their addresses, they're clearly interested, but --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Sam, is there a way that the Department can help get a notice out since something happened with the mailing?

MR. HUBBARD: Yes, we can help with identifying, you know, additional properties. I'm sure we could probably put something on our website.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Or a sign on the property like was suggested.

MR. GREEN: We have the sign there now. We have to take it down. I think by ordinance we're required to take that down. It has been up twice, and so you know, on that sign has my name, my phone number and my e-mail address. So, we invited people to contact us. We'll keep doing that, but we have to have a method by which we can put up the signs. If we can work with the Staff to do that, we'll do that.

MR. HUBBARD: Absolutely.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: When does the sign have to come down, Sam?

MR. HUBBARD: I believe it's either five or 10 days upon conclusion of the public hearing.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, so if your e-mail address is on the sign, then that gives people sufficient time if they live in the neighborhood to reach out to you and ask to be included in the community meeting.

MR. GREEN: So, if I may, I would suggest that we go to 750 feet because I have to pick a number.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Sure.

MR. GREEN: And that anyone who is more than 750 feet who is here who would like to be notified of that, if they would contact my office. Please be patient when you contact my office. If many of you call, yes, it's an office, yes, they're trying to do business, yes, we will take care of you. But if we have to get back to you or if you do call in and you need to leave a message, please leave it clearly so that we can make sure we got it.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Terry, would a notice to 750 feet meet your --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: I'm fine with that. I just want the neighbors to have an opportunity since that's something that we recommend and it sounds like they have a lot of concerns that while you got some of those expressed tonight, there might be other people who --

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: I don't know if 750 feet is going to be enough because you've got that large tract of land that has --

COMMISSIONER DROST: But that's not counted, I don't think.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: It's beyond that.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, those are taken out, the roads and --

MR. GREEN: Yes, we exclude right-of-ways.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: And keep in mind, the requirement, first of all, there is not a requirement for public notice. Second of all, the requirement for this meeting is only 250 feet. So, I think we have to cut it off somewhere. That doesn't mean that people outside that radius can't come.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Right.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: So, the people in the community are free to share that information with their neighbors.

MR. GREEN: If I may say one other thing relative to a neighbor meeting, when we become a neighbor, not if, when we become a neighbor, we will become a neighbor. We become then part of that element that can help get an improvement of that signal. Can you think of another development that would have more interest in getting an improvement of that intersection?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Right, it's a good point.

Okay, so we have discussed an amendment to the motion.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Yes, I'll withdraw the second so that you can amend the motion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Would you?

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Sure. I think we should add a seventh --

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Item seven to require that before going to Village Board.

COMMISSIONER DROST: I'll second the amended motion.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, any further discussion?

MR. HUBBARD: So, just for clarity, the seventh condition is the Petitioner, prior to appearing before the Village Board, will hold another community meeting with advertisement and invitations to all property owners within 750 feet?

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Correct? Correct, okay.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: That sounds great, Sam. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Okay, roll call.

MR. HUBBARD: All right, Commissioner Jensen.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Drost.

COMMISSIONER DROST: Aye.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Ennes.

COMMISSIONER ENNES: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Green.

COMMISSIONER GREEN: Yes, with comment.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Lorenzini.

COMMISSIONER LORENZINI: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Commissioner Sigalos.

COMMISSIONER SIGALOS: Yes.

MR. HUBBARD: Chair Dawson.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Yes.

Comment?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: My comment is, Lynn, you've made the best argument here tonight.

COMMISSIONER JENSEN: What was that?

COMMISSIONER GREEN: The way you put it, into a very good form, that it makes it very easy to understand why we are here tonight and what we're supposed to do. Thank you for that.

MR. GREEN: And we thank you all. We thank your Staff. Staff go unheralded sometimes and this is my time to be emotional about it. We work in scores and scores and scores of communities. This Staff picks up their phone to talk to you. This Staff gives you feedback that's not just limited to what they have to do but to what they feel in their hearts. It has been truly a pleasure to work with them.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: Great, thank you. We always appreciate hearing that feedback. So, again, unanimous recommendation from us. Again, a recommending body. Sam will keep you apprised of the next steps. You'll move on to the community meeting, but likely we will see you back here again.

MR. ZUNAMON: Thanks everyone.

CHAIRPERSON DAWSON: All right, thank you.

(Whereupon, at 10:37 p.m., the public hearing on the above-mentioned petition was adjourned.)